

Also, a bill (H. R. 15489) for the relief of Hiram S. Hurlbut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15490) granting a pension to Tillie Parkhurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15491) granting a pension to Hester A. Barber; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4775. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring daylight-saving legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4776. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Cadillac Automobile Co., of Boston, urging the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4777. Also, petition of the Gillette Safety Razor Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring an amendment to the tariff laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4778. Also, petition of Stephen J. Francis, of Dorchester, Mass., and John F. Patrick, of Dorchester, Mass., favoring the passage of the special post-office clerks' bill, H. R. 15323; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4779. Also, petition of the W. M. Weston Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring a change in the excess-profits methods, and the Smith-Patterson Co., of Boston, Mass., opposing any increase of taxes on jewelers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4780. Also, petition of Stone & Webster (Inc.), Boston, Mass., favoring the appropriation for the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4781. By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association and citizens of Claremont, Calif., favoring enactment of Smith-Towner bill to create a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

4782. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of bill H. R. 13201; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4783. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of the Haverhill Credit Bureau, of Haverhill, Mass., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

Monday, January 3, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we bless Thee for the privilege of seeing the opening of another year, and we pray for Thy guidance and help through all the manifold duties and problems that may be confronting us. Grant Thy blessing and guidance for these Thy servants in their highly responsible tasks. We ask it for the glory of Thy great name, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

BOIES PENROSE, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania; JAMES D. PHELAN, a Senator from the State of California; and ANDRIEUS A. JONES, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in their seats to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. Smoot and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of Utah certifying to the election of REED SMOOT as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
Executive Department.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, A. D. 1920, REED SMOOT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah

a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1921.

Witness his excellency our governor, Simon Bamberger, and our seal hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 31st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1920.

[SEAL.]

SIMON BAMBERGER,
Governor.

By the governor:

HARDEN BENNION,
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. PAIGE as a member of the commission provided for in section 6 (a) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1920, in the place of Mr. MADDEN, resigned.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 429. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with Henry Blackburn;

S. 1447. An act to correct the naval record of Fred C. Konrad;

S. 1546. An act for the relief of Katie Norvall;

S. 1743. An act for the relief of Matthew McDonald;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of John Healy; and

S. 3218. An act for the relief of Martina Sena, Luis E. Armijo, and Maria Baca de Romero.

PETITIONS.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania praying for the enactment of legislation to pay a bonus to ex-service men who served in the World War; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the repeal of the excess-profits tax, the substantial elimination of the surtaxes, and abandonment of discriminatory profits taxation; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Capt. Charles D. Gridley Garrison No. 4, Department of Pennsylvania, Army and Navy Union, of Erie, Pa., favoring increased retired pay for volunteer officers and enlisted men who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and Public Health Service; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution in the nature of a petition by the Chamber of Commerce, of Arkansas City, Kans., favoring the designation of the Chillicothe Indian School as an agricultural and industrial institution; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. KENDRICK (for Mr. WARREN) presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the Fremont County Wool Growers' Association, of Lander, Wyo., favoring an embargo on frozen meats, hides, and wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a report in the nature of a petition adopted on October 13, 1920, by the United States District Court, western district of Washington, southern division, praying that more drastic penalties be imposed for violations of the so-called Harrison drug act; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4748) to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Fillmore National Forest, Utah; and

A bill (S. 4749) to provide for the disposition of boron deposits; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 4750) providing for the appointment of superintendents and assistant superintendents of delivery in certain post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 4751) making Armistice Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 4752) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stackhouse; and

A bill (S. 4753) granting an increase of pension to William F. Blanchard; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4754) providing for the bringing to the United States of a body of an unknown American killed on the battle

fields of France, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4755) granting an increase of pension to Marian Martin.

A bill (S. 4756) granting an increase of pension to James Flannigan; and

A bill (S. 4757) granting a pension to Bernard Mulhern; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4758) granting a pension to Louise R. Stevenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4759) granting an increase of pension to Adam S. Bridgefarmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4760) granting a pension to James H. Pipes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 4761) granting a pension to James C. Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 234) authorizing transportation for dependents of Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ACQUISITION OF OIL LANDS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. McKELLAR. I introduce a bill relative to the acquisition of oil lands by foreign Governments, and ask that it be read at length.

The bill (S. 4747) relative to acquisition of oil lands by foreign Governments was read the first time by its title and the second time at length and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That deposits of oil or oil shale, or the manufactures or refined products thereof, in the United States or its Territories or dependencies, or any land containing such deposits, or any stock or bond interest in corporations owning such land or deposits, or contracts for the purchase and development of the same, when the purpose is to export such products or otherwise to use them in foreign commerce, shall hereafter not be acquired or owned by any foreign Government or by the nationals of any foreign Government whenever the United States or its nationals having a like purpose are prohibited from acquiring such lands or rights or deposits or manufactured or refined products thereof owned or controlled by the Governments of such foreign countries, directly or by their dominions, dependencies, mandatories, spheres of influence, or otherwise, or the nationals of such Governments or foreign countries: *Provided,* That in all cases where the Government of the United States or its nationals is permitted to acquire such lands or deposits, or manufactured or refined products of same, or contracts for the purchase or development of the same, under foreign Governments or their dominions, mandatories, or dependencies, a like privilege to such foreign Governments or their nationals shall be accorded by the Government of the United States.

Sec. 2. That oil or oil shale, and the manufactured or refined products of same, shall not hereafter be exported to any foreign Government or to the nationals of any foreign Government in any case where such foreign Government, its dominions, dependencies, or mandatories refuse to permit the United States or its nationals to acquire and ship the said deposits or the manufactured or refined products to the United States or otherwise to use the same in foreign commerce; or where the vessels of the United States or the vessels of the nationals of the United States are discriminated against by any foreign Government or its nationals in the furnishing of oil or oil facilities, or in the acquiring of oil-supply stations in the territory of such foreign Governments, or its dominions, dependencies, protectorates, mandatories, or spheres of influence.

Sec. 3. The Shipping Board of the United States is hereby required to report on or before July 1, 1921, what foreign Governments, dominions, dependencies, protectorates, or mandatories, if any, are violating this act, and thereafter no oil or oil shale or the manufactured or refined products of same shall be exported to any foreign Government or its nationals so reported by the Shipping Board to be violating said act. Should said Shipping Board, by resolution of its members duly spread upon the minutes, report any Government, dominion, mandatory, or dependency as violating said act, the President, under and by virtue of this act, shall at once issue his proclamation declaring an embargo against shipping any of said products to such foreign Government or its dependencies, mandatories, or nationals; nor shall any of said products be exported to any foreign Government or its nationals until the Shipping Board reports that such Government or its dominions, protectorates, or mandatories are no longer violating this act, in which case the President shall issue his proclamation removing the embargo.

Sec. 4. Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship or take out of the United States any oil or oil shale or the manufactured or refined products of same, in contravention of this act, and after the President has issued his proclamation as aforesaid, the provisions hereof shall be enforced by the same officers, with like forfeitures and penalties and under like proceedings, provided in Title 6 of the act of Congress approved June 15, 1917, being an act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, etc., and known as the espionage act.

AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment is, on page 94, line 5, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. That officers and members of the Metropolitan police and the fire department of the District of Columbia and the United States park police shall be allowed increased compensation for the fiscal year 1922 in accordance with the provisions of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1922 at one-half the rate allowed the other employees of the District of Columbia in said act.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 22, insert, after line 12, the following:

Thirty-seventh Street NW., between Reno Road and Chevy Chase Circle, is hereby designated Chevy Chase Drive, and the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby directed to enter such change on the records of his office.

FORCIBLE ENTRY AND DETAINER.

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4746) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in relation to forcible entry and detainer," which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS ABROAD.

Mr. EDGE. I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 416), as follows:

Whereas hundreds of millions of dollars are being solicited from the American people for the relief of women and children in foreign lands, and the American people, as they always do, are properly and gladly responding with unbounded liberality, in appreciation and thankfulness for their own blessings and in true sympathy for those in want; and

Whereas as a business people the people of the United States are solicitous that every dollar so contributed is really necessary and shall do a dollar's worth of good to those in need, and that no one group of unfortunates shall profit at the expense of any other group, but that all shall share equally in the relief that the American people rejoice to provide; and

Whereas most of such contributions are made on the statements of individuals and organizations soliciting subscriptions, and oftentimes without real knowledge by the generous people who make them as to actual conditions and needs—a knowledge which would stimulate, rather than discourage, American aid; and

Whereas as a practical business people they should have official knowledge in order to make their contributions the more positively efficacious: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, requested to obtain at once through the consular or other official representatives of the United States in foreign lands accurate information as to the actual conditions and the needs and necessities of the women and children of various distressed nations, countries, or foreign dependencies, and transmit the same to the Senate at the earliest possible moment, so that the people of the United States may make their contributions intelligently, with the greatest good to the greatest number of sufferers, and through this information may be inspired to greater good works through confidence that their money and supplies are really necessary properly to alleviate suffering and distress.

And further to ascertain, if possible, and report to the Senate what the various Governments in which such suffering exists are doing, looking toward the alleviation of such distressful conditions.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for two or three minutes to explain what I think is the necessity for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

As every Senator well knows, there is an intensive campaign on at the present moment to raise, or proposing to raise, millions of dollars for relief abroad. It does seem to me that the American people are entitled to and should have, without questioning in the slightest degree the humanitarian purpose and the necessity therefor, all the information it is possible for the Government to obtain for them. We have complete representation, of course, through our consuls, throughout the world and in these particular points where it is proposed that the relief shall be expended.

I am quite sure, if the information could be secured, it would be welcomed by those who are giving their time endeavoring to raise these large sums. If all that we hear is true, and these great sums are necessary, then such actual report will stimulate the collections. If they are not, necessarily and most certainly the American people should know it. So it appears to me as a businesslike resolution absolutely backing up and in the interest of making the campaign successful.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

KERENSKY GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA.

Mr. NORRIS. I submit a Senate resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury for certain information. I ask that it be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 417) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate the following information:

1. Are funds of the United States being used either directly or indirectly to support or maintain an embassy in the city of Washington, D. C., representing the so-called Kerensky government of Russia, and if so, how much money has been thus expended and what authority is there for such expenditure?

2. Was money advanced from the Treasury of the United States to establish a credit on behalf of the Kerensky government, and if so, in what amount, and for what purpose was it used?

3. What amount of money, if any, does the Kerensky government owe to the Government of the United States; how is it secured; what rate of interest does it bear, and when does it mature?

4. After the downfall of the Kerensky government did the Government of the United States purchase war material or other supplies from the officials of the Kerensky government with funds of the United States, and if so, what was the nature of the supplies; how much money was paid for the same; and was the purchase made at a time when the Kerensky government was indebted to the United States, and, if so, in what amount?

5. Has the Government of the United States taken any steps to reimburse itself for money advanced or loaned to the Kerensky government?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, do I understand the resolution is offered for immediate action?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is the first proposal of the matter, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is any objection the resolution will go over.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should prefer to have it go over until to-morrow, so that I may have a chance to look into it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

PETER M'KAY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 390) for the relief of Peter McKay, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out the numerals "\$2,500" and insert "\$939."

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

KATHRYN WALKER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2371) for the relief of Kathryn Walker, which was, in line 9, after the word "act," to insert "Provided further, That the relief granted be made conditional upon the land being free from valid adverse claim at the time payment is made under the terms of the bill."

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My attention was distracted for the moment. Will the Senator state what the bill is?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a relief bill for a certain person in New Mexico. The House made an amendment to the bill providing that the beneficiary shall receive title if no valid adverse claim is made to the land. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We have the original bill here?

Mr. SMOOT. The original bill is at the desk.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The bill as passed by the Senate was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to Kathryn Walker (formerly Kathryn McKnight) for the northeast quarter of section 12, township 29 south, of range 7 west, New Mexico meridian: *Provided*, That the said Kathryn Walker pay the lawful price of the land within six months after the approval of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

FINANCING OF AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I read a remarkable statement in one of the afternoon newspapers during the latter part of last week. The article is headed "Houston to decide war finance fate," and is as follows:

President Wilson has sent the resolution passed by Congress reviving the War Finance Corporation to Secretary of the Treasury Houston, and will be guided in vetoing or signing the measure by his recommendations, it was learned from an authoritative source yesterday.

Houston appeared before the Senate in opposition to the resolution, which, he says, will benefit the General Electric and International Harvester Cos. and the United States Steel Corporation more than it will the farmers. It is understood that the measure will be vetoed. Should the President veto the resolution an attempt will be made to pass it over his head.

The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Agricultural Committee when it had under consideration the joint resolution to revive the War Finance Corporation and presented his views very fully in opposition to that joint resolution. He made the statement before the committee that there were certain large interests that would get the benefit should the corporation be revived; but Mr. Meyer, who was managing director of the War Finance Corporation and thoroughly informed as to the duties of that corporation and its operations, also appeared before the committee, and was a very fair witness. Touching the applications that were on file at the time the War Finance Corporation was suspended, he stated, on page 22 of the hearings, before our committee:

Under more or less similar arrangements the War Finance Corporation financed the export of \$12,000,000 of wheat to Belgium and \$5,000,000 of condensed milk to various countries in Europe. At the time that it was requested by the Secretary to suspend financing exports it had applications involving the export of \$17,500,000 of copper, \$2,200,000 fabricated steel to Italy, \$5,000,000 "Black Patch" tobacco from Tennessee and Kentucky, \$4,000,000 cotton to Czechoslovakia for a large southern exporter, \$25,000,000 cotton to Czechoslovakia for a group of southern bankers, \$3,000,000 for cotton to Italy by a group of bankers, \$9,000,000 by a group of bankers for export of cotton to Italy, \$24,000,000 for the export of cotton by a syndicate of banks headed by one of the largest national banks in the United States, \$2,400,000 by a group of bankers for coal to Italy, \$4,000,000 by a group of bankers for cotton to Italy, \$4,000,000 for ships to be bought or constructed in this country for Italy; in all, \$100,000,000 in applications promising practical results with adequate security, according to the opinion of the directors of the War Finance Corporation.

It is not a debatable question that it remained for those who were operating the War Finance Corporation to exercise their own judgment in allowing such applications to be taken care of as might be presented to the War Finance Corporation; and it seems to me that the words of the Secretary of the Treasury himself almost constitute an indictment against his management of the War Finance Corporation when he says that should it be revived the Bethlehem Steel Co. or the International Harvester Co. or the General Electric Co. would be benefited and the farmers of the country overlooked.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would depend upon the character of the men whom he recommended for directors, would it not?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct. We all know that if he saw fit to allow the farmers of the country to obtain loans with which to export their products, it could be done, and that, as Mr. Meyer says, when the corporation suspended business \$100,000,000 worth of applications were on file, most of which were to take care of the export of farming products of this country. If the corporation should be revived, the Congress has expressed its opinion that agricultural products should be first taken care of, and there is no good reason advanced in that particular by the Secretary of the Treasury why the War Finance Corporation should not be revived.

However, Mr. President, we all know the situation at the White House. We know that since the President was taken sick he has not been so free to advise with the Congress as he was prior to that time. We know that the information which he obtains, as a general rule, is from his cabinet officers, and it would seem to me very unfair to the country indeed, it would be very unfair to the Congress of the United States and to the representatives of the American people, should the Secretary of the Treasury have his way and his advice be taken by the President of the United States.

The Senate of the United States, by practically a unanimous vote, said that the War Finance Corporation should be revived and should resume business. There was no opposition to that proposition to amount to anything at the other end of the Capitol. The people of this country believe that some benefit will accrue from a revival of that corporation. What we now need is markets abroad and credits to obtain those markets. So I can not understand the reasoning and the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury in continuing to oppose the revival of the War Finance Corporation after his statement to the Agricultural Committee of the Senate when the Congress has declared itself.

Let me read to the Senate the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury on that point. Before doing so, I desire to say these questions were propounded to him, Senators, because we were fearful that this very situation might arise; we wanted to adopt means that would revive the War Finance Corporation, and we thought if the Senate and the House of Representatives should express their opinion by a majority that that corporation should be revived, the Secretary of the Treasury, being only

one man, would at least accept that direction and renew the functioning of that important corporation. So certain questions were propounded to him with that object in view.

I asked the question:

Mr. Secretary, you do not have any doubt that under the law now the War Finance Corporation could function if you and those who work with you saw fit to allow it to function?

Secretary HOUSTON. No; I think it could borrow money.

Senator HARRISON. Now, if the Congress should differ with you and your conclusions touching the operations of the War Finance Corporation, what could they do to get the thing set in motion and assist, if they thought it wise?

Secretary HOUSTON. It could direct it by legislation to do so.

Senator HARRISON. The Congress could direct it?

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes; by legislation.

Senator HARRISON. And then it could function speedily, notwithstanding any views you may have had in the past?

Secretary HOUSTON. Certainly. If a law is enacted directing the corporation to function, it goes without saying that it would function.

Senator HARRISON. The reason I say that is that some one has intimated that your past views might interfere with its functioning.

Secretary HOUSTON. I could have no discretion as to carrying out a direct mandatory act. I can exercise discretion only where the law makes it possible and where in my judgment it would be against the public interests to do a certain thing, and should I have discretionary power I would decline to do it, as in the present instance.

So, notwithstanding those statements by the Secretary of the Treasury to the committee—and the committee followed his suggestions and the joint resolution was passed through both Houses of Congress by practically a unanimous vote—we find from articles appearing in the newspapers that he is using the power of his office in advising the President to veto that very important legislation.

Mr. President, I have been one of those in this Chamber who have followed the President not only in most instances in his domestic policies but in his foreign policies as well, but if he should see fit to follow the advice of this one official of the Government, contrary to the unanimous opinion of the Congress of the United States and the sentiment of the people of the country, I hope that the Senate and the body at the other end of the Capitol will take up immediately the joint resolution and pass it over the President's veto. I shall join cheerfully in such an operation.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.). The morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

The first business on the calendar was the resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership, and Federal aid therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. CALDER. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1660) to provide a division of tuberculosis in and an advisory council for the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let that go over, Mr. President. The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade was announced as next in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Jacob Nice was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 172) for the selection of a special committee to investigate the administration of the office of the Alien Property Custodian was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2785) to provide aid from the United States for the several States in prevention and control of drug addiction and the care and treatment of drug addicts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) directing the Court of Claims to investigate claims for damages growing out of the riot of United States Negro soldiers at Houston, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2672) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2444) to create the commission on rural and urban home settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3201) fixing the salary of the district attorney for the eastern district of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) providing that whenever the United States becomes a member of the League of Nations this Government should present to the council or the assembly of the league the state of affairs in Ireland and the right of its people to self-government was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3090) to repeal the espionage act was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill may go over, and I ask permission just for one moment to say that while it is reported adversely I am very glad the committee reported it, so that it is on the calendar, as it seems to me the time has come when we ought to repeal war legislation. At some appropriate time I shall undertake to bring it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to reimburse Isalah Stephens, postmaster at McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., for money and postage stamps stolen was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3109) to amend section 26 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let that go over.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to the consideration of this measure. It is a very important one. We ought to take it up at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that the further reading be dispensed with. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1455) for the relief of John L. O'Mara was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2954) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert F. Smith, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3152) for the relief of George W. Mellinger was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Adolph F. Hitchler was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I believe that that investigation has already been made. The Senator reporting the bill is not here; but, if newspaper reports are correct, that report has already been made, and recommendations have been made to the Secretary of War. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2822) making available additional moneys for the reclamation fund, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3395) to discontinue the improvement to provide a channel extending from the sea to the Charleston Navy Yard was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3396) to discontinue the construction of a dry dock at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 310) for the relief of John Murphy was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2292) for the relief of the William Gordon Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to permit the payment for certain lands whereon Army supply bases are situated was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3430) fixing the salaries of certain United States attorneys and United States marshals was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 8078) to regulate the importation of coal-tar products, to promote the establishment of the manufacture thereof in the United States, and, as incident thereto, to amend the act of September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1853) to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3725) authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Capt. David McD. Shearer for compensation for the adoption and use and acquisition by the United States Government of his patented inventions was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1391) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7785) to provide revenue for the Government, to establish and maintain in the United States the manufacture of laboratory glassware, laboratory porcelain ware, optical glass, scientific and surgical instruments was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 10074) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KELLOGG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7705) to amend section 339 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913, in respect to the tariff on buttons of steel and pearl was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4437) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote the production of tungsten ores and manufactures thereof in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2989) for the relief of Walter I. Whitty was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3139) for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. WADSWORTH. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 10918) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6238) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of zinc ores and manufactures thereof in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4166) to provide for election contests in the Senate of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that bill was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been passed yet. It is in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1519) making appropriations for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3251) granting longevity pay from and including August 5, 1917, to certain officers and enlisted men was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on December 31, 1920, approved and signed the bill (S. 4565) extending the time for the doing of annual assessment work on mining claims for the year 1920, to and including July 1, 1921.

FINANCING AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS—VETO MESSAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the message, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning, without my signature, Senate joint resolution 212:

Joint resolution directing the War Finance Corporation to take certain action for the relief of the present depression in the agricultural sections of the country, and for other purposes.

The joint resolution directs the revival of the activities of the War Finance Corporation. This corporation is a governmental agency. Its capital stock is owned entirely by the United States. It was created during hostilities for war purposes. The temporary powers which it is now proposed to revive were conferred in March, 1919, to assist, if necessary, in the financing of exports. The general powers of the corporation expire six months after the termination of the war and the special powers with respect to the financing of exports expire one year after the termination of the war. While we are technically still in a state of war, it unquestionably was presumed, when this added power was granted, that peace would have been formally proclaimed before this time and that the limitation of one year would have expired.

In May, 1920, in view of the fact that export trade had not been interrupted but had greatly expanded, and that exports were being privately financed in large volumes, the War Finance Corporation, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury and with my approval, suspended the making of advances.

This resolution was passed by the Congress apparently in view of the recent sudden and considerable fall in prices, especially of agricultural commodities, with the thought that some European countries to which certain products were customarily shipped before the war might again be enabled to resume their importation and that larger masses of domestic exports to European countries generally might be stimulated, with the resulting enhancement of domestic prices. I am in full sympathy with every sound proposal to promote foreign trade along sound business lines. I am not convinced that the method proposed is wise, that the benefits, if any, would offset the evils which would result, or that the same or larger advantages can not be secured without resort to Government intervention. On the contrary, I apprehend that the resumption of the corporation's activities at this time would exert no beneficial influence on the situation in which improvement is sought, would raise false hopes among the very people who would expect most, and would be hurtful to the natural and orderly processes of business and finance.

Large Government credits were extended during the war to certain European governments associated with us in the struggle. These ceased several months after the armistice, except for commitments already made. They should not now be resumed, either directly or indirectly. The recent Brussels conference, composed of experts from many European countries and from other nations, itself expressed the opinion that further credits should not be accorded directly by governments. I do not believe that they should be accorded indirectly.

Exports of domestic products have not declined since the armistice. On the contrary, they have greatly increased. From an aggregate value before the war of less than two and one-half billions of dollars, and of about six billions the last year of hostilities, they rose in the calendar year 1919 to more than \$7,900,000,000, and this figure will probably be exceeded for the last calendar year. For the first eleven months of the last calendar year we exported more than seven and one-half billion dollars' worth of domestic merchandise. These have been largely privately financed. The difficulty in the way of still larger exports does not seem to lie so much in the lack of financial ability here as in Europe's lack of means to make payment. Her productive energies and the services which she renders have not yet reached a point where they balance the value of commodities taken from this Nation, and her ability to furnish

for additional exports securities which business men would feel justified in taking is restricted. The experts of the Brussels conference reported that "one of the chief obstacles to the granting of credits is the absence in borrowing countries of sufficient securities for ultimate repayment." Until this obstacle is removed it is difficult to see how materially larger exports to Europe are to be made even if exporters, aided or unaided by Government finance, stand ready to do their part. It is remarkable that Europe is able to make an effective demand for as large a volume of our goods as she is making. It is gratifying evidence of her recovery and progress toward full production and sounder financial conditions.

Under the law, if the activities of the corporation were resumed, no direct advances could be made to producers and, if they could be, they would not accomplish the objects in view. They would not create demand for our products. They could be made only to exporters or to banks engaged in financing exports, and if they did in some measure stimulate exports they would probably not have the effect apparently most desired of substantially increasing those of agricultural commodities. Already, with the larger volume of exports which Europe is taking from us, she is exercising her option of taking a smaller volume of some of our principal agricultural products, such as meats, presumably because she herself has become more largely self-sufficient, or is again providing herself with supplies from distant countries which, with the opening up of shipping since the armistice, have once more found their place in the markets of the world.

It is highly probable that the most immediate and conspicuous effect of the resumption of the corporation's activities would be an effort on the part of exporters to shift the financing of their operations from ordinary commercial channels to the Government. This would be unfortunate. It would continue the Government as an active factor in ordinary business operations. If activities of any considerable magnitude resulted, they would necessitate the imposition of additional taxes or further borrowing, either through the War Finance Corporation or by the Treasury. In either case new burdens would be laid upon all the people. Further borrowing would in all likelihood tap the very sources which might otherwise be available for private operations or which the Treasury is now compelled to reach to meet current obligations of the Government. There is no question that the borrowing of the Government should be limited to the minimum requirements, and that the Government should not be called upon further to finance private business at public expense. To the extent that Europe is able to furnish additional securities, private financial institutions here will doubtless find means of giving the necessary accommodation. The way has been opened for added legitimate efforts to promote foreign trade. Financial agencies in aid of exports, privately financed, have already been planned to operate under the act approved December 24, 1919, authorizing the organization of banking corporations to do foreign banking business. One corporation has been organized in the South and a second of large scope is in course of development. These agencies may be expected to act as promptly and as liberally and helpfully as sound business conditions will permit. Through reliance on such enterprises, rather than through Government intervention, may we expect to secure a return to stable business relations. For many months there has been a demand that war agencies should be abolished and that there should be less Government interference with business. I have sympathized with this view, and believe that it is applicable to foreign trade as well as to domestic business. I am of the opinion that now, more than two years after the armistice, the Nation should resume its usual business methods and return to its reliance on the initiative, intelligence, and ability of its business leaders and financial institutions.

We shall not witness an immediate satisfactory adjustment of domestic and international trade relations. The burdens of war are not lifted when the fighting ceases. One sad thing about war is that it leaves behind it a legacy of economic ills and of suffering from which there is no escape. Conditions, however, are improving both here and abroad. The difficulties with which we are now confronted are of small consequence in comparison with those which we have met and overcome. Fuller restoration awaits the adoption of constructive measures of large consequence: the secure establishment of a just peace in the world; the cessation of fighting everywhere; the more complete resumption in Europe of the normal courses of industry, the return of her people to sounder fiscal and banking policies, and the breaking down within her borders of harmful restrictions.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
3 January, 1921.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this veto message is of such great importance to the country that I hope the Senator in charge of the joint resolution will call for immediate action, and in order that absent Senators may be here and know what is before the Senate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	McKellar	Sheppard
Ball	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Hale	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Harris	New	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Harrison	Norris	Smoot
Calder	Heflin	Nugent	Spencer
Capper	Henderson	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Hitchcock	Page	Swanson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Townsend
Edge	Kellogg	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	Kendrick	Poinexter	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Kenyon	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
France	Keyes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Knox	Reed	Wolcott.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the President's message and the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The pending question is, Shall Senate joint resolution 212 pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate at any length in addressing myself to the pending question, but I do not think I should let the vote come without a statement of the reason why I intend to vote that the joint resolution shall become a law notwithstanding the veto of the President.

When the joint resolution was originally before the Senate I voted in favor of its passage. I have not changed my mind as to the advisability of the measure becoming a law. I realize that the time has come when the great war endeavors of the Nation should cease and that we should readjust ourselves to peace conditions and allow business to flow along the usual channels that direct it in times of peace; but I see nothing harmful in the joint resolution and I see much that may be of service to the very distressed condition of the country.

In times of distress and financial danger there are many things that come before a legislative body that are initially wrong, fundamentally dangerous, which must be stopped, but when an opportunity comes where we may be of service in carrying the country over a dangerous situation, I think it is wise on the part of the Government to be responsive to those conditions and grant that aid as speedily as possible.

I have noted the objections stated by the President in his message. I have no point of difference with his expressed desire that war functions should cease and that we should return to peace conditions. Technically, we are still in a state of war. Technically, we can properly pass the joint resolution. During the period of the war the War Finance Corporation functioned properly and successfully in aid of business and in aid of the Government. There is no reason that I can see why it can not render aid to the people of the country as effectively now as it did during the stress of war. So far as our financial conditions are concerned, we are in a far more distressed situation to-day than we were at any period during the war.

It is not unusual, by proper methods along governmental channels, for the Government of the United States, by the weight of its influence and its power, to aid in the easing of financial conditions and distressed credit conditions.

I can recall the time many years ago when a Republican President of the United States withdrew from the Treasury tax moneys of the people and deposited them in New York banks in order to prevent financial difficulties and panic stringencies. Although that action might have been going to the extreme limit, it seemed to meet with the approval of the American people. More than that, I can recall in the hours of the present administration that the Secretary of the Treasury, through the Federal reserve system, placed moneys in the Federal reserve banks to be used for the purpose of loaning to the banks in that system in order that they might move the crops to the market of their final destination, exercising a governmental function with the power and the credit and the money of the Federal Government for the purpose of moving the crops to prevent stressed conditions at home.

All that the joint resolution proposes to do is to use the credit of the Federal Government through recognized govern-

mental agencies to secure the money to move crops to foreign markets and relieve a distressed condition at home. I see no fundamental reason against the measure if the law is carefully and safely administered. There is no danger to the Treasury and no danger to the finances of the country. The administration that is charged with carrying out the terms of the joint resolution is the same administration that properly and fairly and justly administered the law but a few months ago in the times of war distress. I see no reason why the country or the Congress should not expect, and properly expect, that the provisions of the joint resolution can be and will be administered as safely, as conservatively, and as satisfactorily as was done a few months ago. Therefore I think it should become a law notwithstanding the veto of the President.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, some days ago I gave notice that I would submit to the Senate to-day, upon the close of morning business, some observations upon the treaty which had been negotiated between the United States and Colombia. I am anxious to proceed with my address, but I am reluctant to interpose it at this time in view of the importance of the subject which is under consideration, and I shall not do so unless the pending motion will result in extended discussion. If it is the intention of Senators to argue the proposal to pass the joint resolution over the veto of the President, I see no reason why I should not proceed. If not, I shall willingly wait until a final vote is taken.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not believe that among those who are favorable to the passage of the joint resolution there is any intention to have an extended debate. So far as I know they are ready to vote. I think if the Senator will wait a few minutes he can ascertain whether that is true. I believe there will be no debate to amount to anything.

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield the floor for the present, but with the understanding that if the debate is to be prolonged and I am able again to obtain the floor I shall proceed with my address.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let us vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIMBY] and vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote were he present, and not being able to secure a transfer of my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. In his absence, and not knowing how he would vote if present, I refrain from voting. Were I permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have temporarily a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who is absent. I understand that his vote, if present, would be the same as my own. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I have been informed that if he were present he would vote as I am intending to vote. Therefore, upon that assurance, I am going to exercise the privilege of voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. Not knowing how he would vote if he were present, I transfer the pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I do not know how he would vote if present. Therefore I am not at liberty to vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. I do not know how he would vote if present. Therefore I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I understand, if present, he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. RANSDELL. My colleague [Mr. GAY] is absent on important business and is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. COLT. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]. I do not know how he would vote were he present. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GRONNA. I was requested to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber, but that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCLEAN. I inquire if the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. MCLEAN. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore will withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. EDGE (after having voted in the negative). I understand that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has not voted. I have a general pair with him, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. KELLOGG (after having voted in the affirmative). I am informed that the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], with whom I have a general pair, if present would vote "yea," and I will therefore let my vote stand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and vote "yea."

Mr. MCLEAN. I am assured that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], with whom I am paired, if present, would vote the same way that I am going to vote on this question. I shall, therefore, vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I was requested to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are absent from the Chamber by reason of illness.

I desire also to announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]; and

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY].

The roll call resulted—yeas 53, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Shepard
Ball	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hefflin	New	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Henderson	Norris	Spencer
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Nugent	Stanley
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Swanson
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Underwood
Dial	Kellogg	Phipps	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
France	Kenyon	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Gore	McCumber	Pomerene	
Gronna	McKellar	Ransdell	
Hale	McLean	Reed	

NAYS—5.

Elkins	Keyes	Sutherland	Thomas
Gerry			

NOT VOTING—38.

Chamberlain	Glass	Moses	Smith, Md.
Colt	Harding	Myers	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Sterling
Curtis	King	Owen	Trammell
Dillingham	Kirby	Penrose	Warren
Edge	Knox	Robinson	Watson
Fall	La Follette	Sherman	Williams
Fernald	Lenroot	Shields	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Simmons	
Gay	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 53 and the nays are 5. A quorum being present, and more than two-thirds thereof having voted "yea," the joint resolution is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

TREATY WITH COLOMBIA.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, shortly after I became a Member of this body a treaty which had been negotiated by the administration of President Taft with the Republic of Colombia was laid before the Senate. That circumstance provoked considerable interest, both in the Senate and in the country, in consequence of which I deemed it my duty to investigate the circumstances which led up to and culminated in the formation and recognition of the new Republic of Panama. During my investigation that treaty was withdrawn, and consequently we did not pass upon it.

A subsequent treaty negotiated with the same Government by President Wilson was then sent to the Senate in place of the one which had been withdrawn. Pending the consideration of that treaty I prepared some observations upon the subject and gave notice that I would present them to the consideration of the Senate. Before doing so I was requested to postpone the delivery of the address for reasons which seemed to me at the time convincing. A second notice was followed by the same result, although I then reluctantly consented to the request. Since the death of former President Roosevelt I have regretted that I consented to the postponement, because I would have much preferred to have submitted my remarks to the Senate during his lifetime. It will be recalled, however, that in the campaign of 1912 Mr. Roosevelt, as a candidate for the Presidency, became the victim of a would-be assassin, whereupon one of his competitors, Gov. Woodrow Wilson, announced that, owing to that unfortunate occurrence, he would not during Mr. Roosevelt's disability discuss any questions or propositions directly affecting or concerning him. To that announcement Mr. Roosevelt responded in these words:

Whatever could with truth and propriety have been said against me and my cause before I was shot can with equal truth and propriety be said against me now, and it should be so said; and the things that can not be said now are merely the things that ought not to have been said before. This is not a contest about any man; it is a contest concerning principles.

With the sentiment thus so well and so clearly expressed I am in the heartiest accord, and I feel therefore at liberty to read to the Senate what I have prepared without change either in substance or in expression. I might add, Mr. President, that I have had reason to expect that this treaty before now would have been laid before the Senate for its consideration, and it was because of that expectation that I determined to speak. The expected in this instance has not happened, and owing to the brevity of the present session it may not occur. Nevertheless, the result of my efforts perhaps should be laid before the Senate since those who in the future are to pass upon this very important subject may be thus relieved of the burden of much preparation that might otherwise be required.

No argument is needed to support the assertion that a sincere and cordial friendship between the United States and the Latin Republics to the south of us should have been established long ago. Nor is evidence needed to demonstrate that no such sentiment marks their opinion of our purposes, our policies, our institutions, or their intercourse with us. Our warm expressions of regard for them have not been reassuring; and our self-assumed guaranty of their political integrity has frequently challenged their avowed distrust. They measure both by the standards which we have erected along the pathway of our national history, and estimate with some degree of accuracy our precepts by our example. They have observed that with the exception of Alaska, the Gadsden purchase, and the purchase of the Virgin Islands, our extensions of territory in America since the announcement of the Monroe doctrine in 1823 have been wrested from Mexico, from Spain, and from Colombia; that in 1898, while carefully assuring the world that we waged war against Spain for Cuban independence, we did not hesitate to absorb her remaining territories. They have been disturbed by our military occupation of San Domingo, of Nicaragua, and of Haiti, by the eagerness of our citizens for concessions in Central and South America, and by our acquisition of the Philippines, in violation of a fundamental postulate of the Monroe doctrine. These progressive instances of territorial expansion have tended to confirm their suspicion that our magnanimous guardianship might mask a plan of aggression; that our lively apprehension of their foreign colonization might be a pretext, concealing our own designs for territorial expansion. Hence our attitude, whose sincerity has more than once been demonstrated by our actions, has inspired them with no sense either of appreciation or of security; while some of the nations against whose political designs we have safeguarded them have largely monopolized their markets and occasionally influenced their national policies.

Some years ago the senior Senator from Massachusetts expressed a belief that we were being looked upon with a mixture of dread and ill will in South America. This impression shortly afterwards received striking confirmation in the address of Dr. Freos, the president of the Museo Social of Buenos Aires, at the banquet in honor of Col. Roosevelt upon the occasion of his visit to that city. Dr. Freos cordially but honestly outlined the real sentiment of South America in words evidently selected with careful deliberation. He said:

There is a dominating fact in all South America. It is a manifest and undeniable fact, and it would be a great error to my mind to attempt to silence or even to disguise it. This fact, gentlemen, is that there exists a deep sentiment of apprehension which disturbs Spanish America and inspires it with precautions, causing it to withdraw itself instinctively, and to its own hurt, from the grand center of civilizing light and power established in the north of the continent. The establishment of United States interests in Spanish America is feared, because it is feared that they may incite and cause intervention, which no people can accept with good will. Such a fear holds it back from more open and friendly relationship with the great nation on the north.

Col. Roosevelt, the nations of Latin America will not feel at their ease so long as they do not rest in the security that no master may arise from them, either from within or without, and that no one, no matter where he may come from, may place in danger their integrity or their independence and sovereignty.

The evident inspiration for this historic utterance upon such an occasion was the Rooseveltian Latin-American policy, as exemplified by the episode of the Panama Canal. Before that event one element of warmth pervaded the unkindly atmosphere of South American opinion. It was quickened by the fact that throughout our history we had scrupulously observed our treaty obligations. The written word of the Nation had been its bond. No tarnish rested upon it. Administrations came and went, party succeeded party in governmental control, the fires of Civil War flamed to the skies, and battling sections jostled each other like colliding planets, but the Nation's honor suffered no reproach. Under the shelter of such an influence distrust could not permanently endure. The prospects of an ultimate rapprochement between the United States and the nations of Central and South America at the beginning of the year 1903 were not unpromising. Through the agency of the International Bureau of American Republics, precursor of the Pan American Union, we were establishing closer relations of confidence and esteem. A real sentiment of continental Americanism was within the range of early possibilities. An era of good feeling was taking definite outline and Pan Americanism seemed to be slowly rising above the level of the southern horizon.

These conditions were rudely interrupted in the autumn of 1903 by a vaudeville insurrection in Panama, swiftly followed by its secession from Colombia, its official recognition by the American Government, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the new political entity, and the negotiation of a canal treaty with the junta assuming to represent it, by which the United States, in consideration of the sum of \$10,000,000 in gold, acquired the Panama Canal Zone in perpetuity. This action of our Government, ostensibly based upon the rejection by Colombia of a convention designed to accomplish the same purpose, seemed to disregard not only the most obvious principles of international law but our solemn treaty obligations assumed in 1846, and scrupulously observed for 57 years, by whose terms the United States had in consideration of most valuable concessions solemnly guaranteed to Colombia the perpetual sovereignty of the Isthmus.

Latin America held its breath in amazement; the flagrancy of our conduct taxed their credulity and our own. Then followed a revelation of the humiliating details. America had not only recognized and extended her protection to a State in rebellion against the central Government; she had encouraged, if indeed she had not fostered, the insurrection. She had forcibly prevented Colombia from landing troops upon her own soil for the vindication of her own sovereignty. Her prompt and repeated protests were disregarded. She was branded by the President as a blackmailer among the nations, whose infamous conduct in rejecting a treaty justified both the revolt of one of her constituent commonwealths, and his prompt recognition of it. She invoked our treaty obligations and confronted the extraordinary assurance that our action toward Panama was in conformity with them. Too weak to resent the affront, she appealed to our sense of justice. She beseeched us to arbitrate her claims for restitution, but her remonstrances and her appeals have been alike unheeded.

This affront was not to Colombia alone. She was the victim. Her territory was invaded by a friendly nation and partitioned over her protest. She alone demanded reparation; but every Government south of the Rio Grande was aroused in just resentment. As we had violated the sovereignty of Colombia, so might we outrage theirs when our interests or our policies

required it. As we had rewarded rebellion and created republics in Colombia, so might we also spread sedition among their peoples with like result. As we had thrust aside our treaty obligations with her, so might we treat theirs as scraps of paper. As we had ignored our oft-repeated recognitions of international comity and torn a weak but friendly Republic apart, so might they encounter the same fate when the Colossus of the North should will it. To them our tributes to freedom and our ostentatious regard for the rights of small nations and weak peoples sounded like the essence of national hypocrisy.

Mr. President, this great Republic is the last and best citadel of democracy. It has waged war with the mightiest military power the world ever knew that the institutions and the blessings of popular government may not perish. It needs the support and welcomes the friendship of every nation, especially those of the Western Hemisphere. The power whose unspeakable misconduct compelled the United States to draw the sword has deliberately and repeatedly affronted the principal Republics of South America. They feared Germany as we did not. They had long been selected by her for political domination, and she would have overrun them had the Allies failed to overcome her. These countries know this better perhaps than we do. Many of them severed diplomatic relations with Germany, but, with the exception of Brazil and Cuba—the former peopled and ruled by a population descended from the Portuguese—and one or two Central American countries, they did not declare war against her. We do not fully know why, but we can well conjecture. They hated Germany, but they were not sure of America. They had no love for autocracy, but they distrusted a great democracy whose practices did not always square with its principles. The devil was to them no more attractive than the deep sea, and between these alternatives they did little in the world's great conflict. I fear their attitude will not change until we do justice to Colombia.

Pan-Germanism, a far more sinister foe to the Allies than the legions of the Kaiser, may no longer inoculate the southern continent with its deadly poison. But the removal of this evil does not mean the establishment of confidence and respect for America. The suspicions of the Latin survive and may be fed fat by the German protagonist, defeated but not wholly disarmed, partly with the facts of history, partly with the fictions of his own creation; and it may well be that if the process be not interrupted some of our neighbors may give substantial commercial succor to the defeated Teuton lest we may wax too great and powerful for their welfare.

Especially in Colombia might such results develop. She has not forgotten, and until her grievance is heard and adjusted she can not forgive our wanton assault upon her sovereignty. She has crystallized the outrage down to its most trivial incident upon the tablets of her memory. She has written the facts into her curriculums. The children in her schools are taught the story of Panama, which they treasure in their memory. Natural resentment toward America and desire for ultimate justice are part of the national consciousness. The one blot on our escutcheon is the wrong we did to Colombia in 1903.

Mr. President, if we have wronged Colombia, we should make due reparation. If we have done her no injustice, the world, and especially Latin America, should know it as speedily as it can be imparted through the processes of governmental procedure or by a court of arbitration. And we need the friendship of the entire hemisphere, whose estrangement we can neutralize by redressing the wrong, if wrong there be.

I have been so impressed by the conditions thus imperfectly outlined that I have given them a patient and, I trust, an impartial consideration. I have reviewed the facts regarding Panama as disclosed by official hearings, documents, and reports. I have reread contemporaneous and subsequent articles written by men of high position, and presumably familiar with the subject, assailing and upholding America's part in the formative processes of the Republic of Panama; and I am compelled to affirm that our conduct in that unfortunate affair is without justification and therefore indefensible. The only comfort one gathers from the shameful and sordid story is that it finds no precedent in our history. I trust that we may soon acknowledge our fault and make some reparation, lest it again be some time, as it has been, invoked to shelter or justify assault upon the integrity of some weak and helpless nation.

The speedy performance of this insistent duty, not alone because of its justice to Colombia and to ourselves as well but because of its immediate and permanent benefit to our political and commercial future, now of all times most desirable, must be my excuse for a rapid review of the principal facts revealed by the "Story of Panama"—one of the most interesting and valuable documents ever given to the public. In doing this I should at the outset remind the Senate that the most im-

portant lesson taught us by the Spanish War, and particularly by the voyage of the *Oregon* from San Francisco to Cuba, was the imperious necessity of a shorter route between the oceans, to secure which a canal across Nicaragua or the Isthmus should be constructed and owned by the Government. Preliminary but exhaustive investigations theretofore made had demonstrated the superiority of the Nicaragua route, to which both the great political parties unequivocally committed themselves in their platforms of 1896.

Fifty years earlier, and immediately following our acquisition of California, access to which was then possible around the Horn, our Government negotiated a treaty with New Granada to be "religiously observed" while in force. It was made on our initiative in 1846. By the terms of article 35 we secured free transit of goods and passengers across the Isthmus, together with freedom of all Granadan ports on both its coasts. This immensely valuable concession was guaranteed to us by the Granadan Government, not only as to existing modes of communication but as to any and all others to be thereafter constructed by or under its authority. In consideration of the grant of these generous privileges the United States covenanted with New Granada for the perpetuation of its sovereignty over the Isthmus in the following language:

In order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages, and for the favors they have acquired by the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of this treaty, the United States guarantees positively and efficaciously to New Granada by the present stipulation the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned Isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any time while this treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantees, in the same manner, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory.

Because of the disturbed conditions sometimes prevailing in that region, the treaty also provided that if one or more of the nationals of either country should infringe any of its articles, they should be held personally responsible therefor, so that the friendship between the nations should not be thereby disturbed, each party engaging in no way to protect the offender or sanction the violation.

Within a few months after the ratification of the treaty gold was discovered in California, and the rush of emigrants to the western coast began. The Panama Co. was speedily organized in America, and New Granada gave it a monopoly of the Isthmus transit. The great influx of travel over the road developed troubles between travelers and natives, requiring an additional treaty, which, however, expressly declared that it in no respect affected the sovereignty of New Granada over the Isthmus. In 1862, the Republic of New Granada changed its name to the United States of Colombia.

On several occasions between the making of the treaty and the year 1902 our Government was required to define its duties under section 35. I shall not burden the Record with these definitions. Their substance was well expressed by Secretary Seward in 1865, who said:

The purpose of the stipulation was to guarantee the Isthmus against seizures or invasion by a foreign power only. It could not have been contemplated that we would ever become a party to any civil war in that country by defending the Isthmus against another party.

In 1867 Colombia conceded to the Panama Railroad Co. the use and possession of its railroad for 99 years for a royalty of \$250,000 per annum. But 36 years of this time had expired in 1903. The remainder of the term should have yielded a total of \$16,500,000 to the Colombian treasury. Moreover, the road at the end of that time would become the property of the Republic.

In 1869, and again in 1870, at our request, Colombia entered into diplomatic relations with us for the construction of an Isthmian Canal. Each time a treaty was negotiated, extremely liberal in its terms, which Colombia ratified, but which we abandoned. Under these covenants she gave us everything we could have asked for, retaining only her political sovereignty. Of course we had not advanced to the point of asking for that. But the continental railroad companies, one of them owning the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., were even then powerful enough to prevent the ratification of these treaties. Not until eight years thereafter did she execute the Salgar-Wyse contract, afterwards acquired by the Panama Canal Co., under which de Lesseps made his disastrous effort to dig the channel. The new company was organized upon the ruins of the old one in October, 1894, the latter having acquired control of the Panama Railroad Co. in 1888, of which one William Nelson Cromwell became counsel and director in 1893, and special counsel for the New Panama Canal Co. in January, 1896. The baleful activities of this man seem to have actually shaped our governmental policy toward Colombia after the assassination of President McKinley. They began prior to Mr. McKinley's first inauguration, for he appeared in Washington with the meeting of Congress in December, 1896, following the presidential election. He

urged and soon succeeded in inducing Colombia in the interests of the Panama company to call the attention of the American Government to the advantages of the Isthmian over the Nicaraguan route. He then set about defeating all Nicaraguan legislation and, as a matter of course, organized a lobby and a competent press bureau to support his efforts and spread the Panama gospel among the people.

But President McKinley was proof against the new propaganda. In his message of December, 1897, he urged the building of the Nicaraguan Canal under American control. The Morgan bill for that route passed the Senate in January following by 48 to 6. The Senate afterwards attached the Morgan bill to the rivers and harbors bill by a vote of 50 to 3. But Mr. Cromwell was able to defeat both in the House by the substitution of a measure providing for a new Panama Commission, which soon reported in favor of Nicaragua, but afterwards, by the direction of President Roosevelt, reversed its conclusions and recommended the Isthmian route.

In 1900 largely through the influence of Senator Hanna, the Republican national convention reversed its earlier attitude favoring Nicaragua and declared for "an Isthmian canal."

Mr. Roosevelt became President in September, 1901. He at once made an announcement of his official policy, among the items of which was the building of the Nicaragua Canal. In January following the House passed the Hepburn bill for Nicaragua by a vote of 309 to 2, shortly after which Mr. Roosevelt committed himself to the Isthmian route.

The Panama Co. concession would, in 1904, expire by limitation. It could not be assigned without the consent of Colombia. It was offered to the United States through Mr. Cromwell for \$40,000,000; but without Colombia's permission the offer was worthless; and so Mr. Cromwell busied himself trying to secure her consent. That Government through its minister, demanded \$20,000,000 from the company for its consent, conditioned upon the adoption of the Isthmian route "without affecting the integrity of its territory or its national sovereignty." In view of her equity in the railroad and the value of her consent to the transfer that sum was not unreasonable. Shortly afterwards, Colombia forbade the transfer of the canal company without first complying with her terms. It may be well to state here that Colombia owned shares of the face value of 5,000,000 francs in the company.

In 1902 Mr. Cromwell wrote a report for the minority of the Senate Canal Committee favoring the Panama route. Senator Hanna, being its chairman, the report bore his name, copies of which Mr. Cromwell scattered over the country. This report opposed the Hepburn and favored the Spooner bill. The latter provided, in substance, that should the title of the company be approved and a satisfactory treaty be concluded with Colombia within a reasonable time the Panama route should be selected; otherwise, in default of either of these conditions, the Nicaragua route should be adopted. The Spooner bill was finally passed and approved by the President June 28, 1902. Mr. Cromwell then devoted himself to securing a fulfillment of the two conditions.

Meanwhile a small insurrection occurred in Panama. Contrary to precedent, and in disregard of the treaty of 1846, and with knowledge of the fact that the officers of the Panama Railroad Co. were notoriously aiding the revolutionists by moving their munitions and refusing transportation to the established government, the President, without saying "by your leave," landed American marines, who virtually disarmed the fighting forces on both sides, thus clearly expressing his contempt for our treaty obligations with Colombia. As a consequence the Colombian minister, Mr. Concha, refused to negotiate at all with our Government for a treaty so long as our troops, in violation of the sovereignty of his country, remained upon her soil without her consent. Pressed by his Government to do so because of Mr. Roosevelt's demand for a speedy agreement, he finally consented, provided the first negotiations were limited to the question of sovereignty. By the President's direction Mr. Hay, on November 28, 1902, consented to this, notwithstanding which Mr. Roosevelt, in his message of January 4, 1904, declared that Colombia's subsequent refusal to ratify the treaty because it involved the relinquishment of her sovereignty was "an afterthought."

Inasmuch as the marines continued to occupy the Isthmus, Minister Concha abruptly resigned his place, which was taken by Dr. Herran as chargé d'affaires, with whom Mr. Cromwell at once sought to establish confidential relations. Eight days after assuming his new duties Dr. Herran sent his Government this ominous warning:

Besides this deferred ultimatum, another danger threatens us. Mr. Shelby M. Cullom, Senator from Illinois and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, maintains that in case Colombia does not lend itself to a satisfactory agreement the Government of the United States

can come to an understanding with the canal company direct, passing over the head of Colombia and expropriating part of our territory, justifying this on the ground of universal public utility, and leaving the compensation due to Colombia to be decided later. President Roosevelt is a determined partisan of the Panama route, and in view of his impetuous and violent disposition it is to be feared that the scheme of Senator Cullom is not distasteful to him.

That, I think, is the ultima ratio of the doctrine of eminent domain. That it was not "distasteful to him" is revealed by himself in his message 18 months later, for he there said:

My intention was to consult Congress as to whether under such circumstances it would not be proper to announce that the canal was to be dug forthwith; that we would give the terms we had offered, and no others; and that if such terms were not agreed to we would enter into an agreement with Panama direct, or take what other steps were needful in order to begin the enterprise.

The first intimation of Mr. Roosevelt's intention to ignore the rights of Colombia, disregard our treaty obligations with her, and proceed as "the mandatory of civilization" to take the Canal Zone if Colombia declined to ratify a treaty of Mr. Cromwell's making, thus came from the lips of Senator Cullom. He doubtless spoke by Mr. Roosevelt's inspiration.

On the day following Dr. Herran's message to his Government Senator Morgan introduced a motion requesting the President to conclude negotiations with Nicaragua under the requirements of the Spooner law, no treaty having been concluded with Colombia. Mr. Cromwell defeated the motion, but it spurred him to greater effort for an agreement for the treaty. He persuaded Herran that action by Colombia was imperative, as the State Department would present an ultimatum on January 5. It did not come quite so soon, although Mr. Hay, on December 31, wrote Mr. Herran that "it is absolutely necessary that I report to the President regarding the condition of our negotiations." January 3, 1903, Herran cabled his Government that the final offer of the American Government to Colombia was \$10,000,000 cash, with an annuity of \$100,000 after nine years, and an equitable increase of it after the completion of the canal.

These terms were not more palatable to Colombia than those affecting her sovereignty. Pressure was therefore brought against Herran personally by Cromwell and officially by Secretary Hay. On January 22 the latter addressed the following letter to him:

DEAR MR. HERRAN: I am commanded by the President to say to you that the reasonable time that the statute accords for the conclusion of negotiations with Colombia for the excavation of a canal of the isthmus has expired, and he has authorized me to sign with you the treaty of which I had the honor to give you a draft, with the modification that the sum of \$100,000 fixed therein as the annual payment be increased to \$250,000. I am not authorized to consider or discuss any change.

Apart from the dictatorial character of this note the obvious inference the Colombian minister would draw from it would be that if Colombia should persist in its refusal to accept the President's terms, the latter would, under the statute, abandon Panama, and negotiate with Nicaragua for a canal concession. But Mr. Herran had reason to know that although this was the alternative of the statute, it was not the President's intention, as Senator Cullom had plainly intimated. He therefore yielded to pressure and signed the treaty at once. Two days later he was instructed by his Government not to sign it. His name has been execrated in Colombia ever since.

The treaty was afterwards ratified by the American Senate, although Colombia promptly brought suit to enjoin the canal company from transferring its concession; whereupon the State Department lent its powerful aid to Mr. Cromwell for the protection of his client. April 7, 1903, Mr. Hay cabled the American minister at Bogota:

Referring to the requests of Colombia to the canal and railroad companies for appointment of agents to negotiate cancellation of present concessions, etc., if the subject arises, inform the Colombia Government that the treaty covers entire matter, and any change would be in violation of the Spooner law.

This instruction, unfounded in fact and in law, was an additional affront to the intelligence and the dignity of Colombia. She was then concerned about her contract with the canal company, a quarrel over which we had no more control than Colombia had over our treaty stipulations with Great Britain. We can well imagine how America would receive a similar communication from England, France, or Germany. Yet Mr. Roosevelt had no compunctions about instructing Colombia that she could not amend a treaty which he had dictated. He did this more than once, and Colombia did what any high-spirited people would have done under such circumstances. She pitched his treaty out of her window. Yet she assigned good reasons for her action, which should have been accepted as conclusive.

Events now moved rapidly. In May the American minister to Colombia came home. He reported to Mr. Cromwell at New York before reporting to Secretary Hay at Washington. If Mr. Cromwell is to be credited, he collaborated with Mr. Hay in writing instructions to our minister at Bogota from this time on.

Referring to Colombia's insistence that the canal company make satisfactory adjustment of her claims as a condition of her consent to transfer, Mr. Hay wrote that—

such action would be inconsistent with the agreements already made between this Government and the canal company, with the act of June 28, 1902, under the authority of which the treaty was made, and with the express terms of the treaty itself.

He also wrote that—

before entering upon any dealings with the new Panama company the present treaty with Colombia was negotiated and signed.

This assertion is not sustained by the facts. At the same time, it can not be reconciled with the further assertion, which Mr. Roosevelt subsequently repeated, that Colombia had initiated our treaty negotiations for the canal.

From the hour that Dr. Herran informed his Government that he had signed the treaty, public opinion in Colombia was strongly against its ratification, since it had been virtually written by the attorney for the canal company in its own interest, and transgressed the sovereignty of the Republic by clauses which cleverly undermined that which was designed to safeguard it. As early as May, 1903, our minister at Bogota informed Secretary Hay that it would be rejected by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Cromwell thereupon suggested to Mr. Hay that our Government deliver its ultimatum to Colombia. He acted in harmony with Mr. Cromwell's views, and on June 9 instructed our minister to say verbally to the Colombian minister of foreign affairs that—

if Colombia should now reject the treaty, or unduly delay its ratification, the friendly understanding between the two countries would be so seriously compromised that action might be taken by the Congress next winter which every friend of Colombia might regret.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3390) to provide further for the national defense; to establish a self-sustaining Federal agency for the manufacture, production, and development of the products of atmospheric nitrogen for military, experimental, and other purposes; to provide research laboratories and experimental plants for the development of fixed-nitrogen production, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. To this gratuitous indignity the foreign minister replied with spirit but with moderation. He reminded Mr. Hay of the narrow margin by which our Senate had ratified the treaty and added that if it had been rejected it would not have diminished the right of Colombia. Referring to the rumored purpose of Mr. Roosevelt to seize Panama if the treaty were rejected, the minister very properly said that—

The Colombian Government has derived the correct conclusion that the only result that can affect adversely the interests of this nation, if their Congress should reject the project of the treaty, is that the Government of the United States will cease negotiations and adopt the Nicaraguan route.

Mr. Cromwell gave contemporaneous assurance to Dr. Herran that Colombia would lose Panama if she did not ratify the treaty, which Herran promptly communicated to Bogota. On June 13 Mr. Cromwell conferred with President Roosevelt, and on the same day, through his press agent, informed the New York World that the President was determined to have the Panama route, that should the treaty be rejected the State of Panama would secede, the President would promptly recognize the new Republic and make a treaty with it which would give our Government the equivalent of absolute sovereignty over the Canal Zone. The World published the news on the following morning and again on July 31. On July 22 our minister, by instructions from Washington, demanded of the Colombian minister the ratification of the treaty without any change whatever. On this occasion he declared that his Government would regard any modification of the treaty as a breach of faith by Colombia and might greatly complicate the friendly relations hitherto existing between the two countries. How any self-respecting nation after this deliberate affront could have done otherwise than reject the treaty passes my comprehension.

The reply of Dr. Rico on August 11 to the American minister's remarkable demand is a model of dignified remonstrance. It is too long to be quoted here, but it reminded him of the right of independent nations to accept, modify, or reject treaties without pressure or dictation, of the fact that the American Senate had frequently done so, particularly with the Hay-Pauncefote treaties, without in any wise disturbing international relations.

The Colombian Senate declared that it could not without violating the national constitution have ratified the treaty; that document forbade the enactment of laws or the ratification of treaties impairing or affecting the national sovereignty. Our

Government was fully informed of this and of Colombia's announcement that its constitution would be so amended as to permit the adoption of the treaty when made satisfactory to her Government. But she refused to be coerced, and on August 12 her Senate rejected the treaty by a unanimous vote. For this exercise of her undoubted right the President of the United States charged her with attempted blackmail. His conduct from the commencement to the close of the episode fortunately has no parallel in the diplomatic history of the United States.

The charge of blackmail is without justification. She did demand from the company a consideration for consenting to the transfer of their property and she was entitled to it. She could secure it only by making it a condition precedent to her ratification of the treaty. In her place we would have been far more exacting, and, because of our strength, far more successful. Colombia has lost a province and with it the canal by her conduct, but she has maintained her national dignity and honor, however great the sacrifice. This should have inspired our tribute of applause. But we ravished her instead, although both the Colombian foreign minister and the American minister at Bogota gave Mr. Hay to fully understand that the disapproval of the treaty was due to the problem of diminished sovereignty, the failure of the canal company to arrange for the transfer of its concessions, and the ultimatum of Mr. Cromwell, communicated through the medium of the State Department, and that the Colombian congress would provide by law for continuing and finishing negotiations for the canal.

Preliminaries for the Panama rebellion began before the treaty was rejected. Capt. James R. Beers, freight agent and port captain for the western terminus of the Panama Railroad, went to New York to confer with Mr. Cromwell regarding it. During his absence Senator Arango sounded a few influential citizens of Panama. In June, Capt. Humphrey, of the Twenty-second, and Lieut. Murphy, of the Seventeenth Infantry, were sent as military intelligences through Venezuela and northern Colombia. In his message to Congress President Roosevelt says that they stopped in Panama on their return in September, and "had no thought of going to Panama when they were sent to South America." Yet they very carefully examined the whole country from Colon to Panama, and furnished the President with minute information comprising every detail essential to an intelligent military campaign on the Isthmus, the best positions for artillery to command Panama and Colon, and the number of mules needed for transport, and which could be procured in inland villages. Did these officers act upon their own initiative? Who is credulous enough to assert it?

About the time the treaty was rejected, Mr. Roosevelt sent for and conferred with Senator Cullom. The next morning the New York Herald quoted Senator Cullom as saying, "We might make another treaty, not with Colombia, but with Panama." Very soon afterwards the Colombian Government instructed Dr. Herran that the Senate, desiring to maintain cordial relations with the United States, had named a commission of three Senators to harmonize legal and natural interests, and our desire to dig the canal. This was communicated to Secretary Hay. The Secretary answered on August 29 that the President was bound by the Isthmian Canal statute, by whose provisions he was given a reasonable time to arrange a satisfactory treaty with Colombia, failing which, "he will then proceed to carry into effect the alternative of the statute." What a pity that he did not do so. And what a greater pity that meanwhile preparations were making under his very nose for a burlesque Isthmian insurrection, to which he must have shut his eyes, for otherwise he would have seen them, and filled his ears with cotton, for otherwise he would have heard them.

Beers returned to Panama with Mr. Cromwell's code book and instructions. While absent, Arango, attorney for the Panama Railroad Co., formed the nucleus of the revolutionary conspiracy. It consisted of himself, Dr. Amador, the company's physician; Mr. Prescott, the company's assistant superintendent; d'Obario, the two Arias, Boyd, Arosemena, and Espinosa. Amador went to New York, ostensibly to see an ostensibly sick son, but actually to secure funds and arms for the revolution. Secret codes for communication to and from Amador were devised before his departure. A fellow passenger was one Duque, an editor of the Isthmus. Cromwell proposed to Duque that if he would furnish \$100,000 to finance the scheme, he, Cromwell, would furnish the security and make Duque the first president of the Republic. He also made an appointment for Duque with Secretary Hay, to whom he gave Duque a note of introduction.

Duque saw Mr. Hay the next day. During the conference Duque reported that Mr. Hay said that the "United States would build the canal, that it did not purpose that Colombia should stand in the way," and that should the revolutionists

occupy Colon and Panama they could depend on the United States to prohibit Colombia's landing troops to attack them and disturb the "free and uninterrupted transit" which our Government was bound by treaty with Colombia to maintain. He also says that Mr. Hay requested him to remain and confer with the President on his return, which he was unable to do.

Duque was not one of the conspirators, else he would not have informed Dr. Herran of the plot, who promptly informed his Government. Mr. Cromwell also gave Dr. Amador a cordial reception. At the same time he took care to cover his own tracks lest the revolution fail and his company come to grief. He shortly afterwards went to Paris.

Enter now upon the stage one Philippe Bunau-Varilla, a Frenchman, engineer and penitentiary shareholder of the New Panama Canal Co., who arrived in New York September 23. Further on I shall refer to his book, which he has recently published. Amador conferred with him at once. Bunau-Varilla promised needed financial support, and undertook to arrange with the American Government for the presence of warships to protect the revolutionists against Colombia. On October 7 Mr. Cromwell called on Mr. Roosevelt, and then said to the Herald correspondent that "the Panama Canal will be built by the United States." Three days after Mr. Roosevelt wrote to Dr. Albert Shaw that he would be delighted if Panama were an independent State, or made itself so at that moment, but he could not say so publicly, as it would instigate a revolt.

Bunau-Varilla and Amador made one or two trips to Washington prior to October 15. On that day the Navy Department ordered Admiral Glass, commanding the Pacific Squadron, to proceed about the 22d instant "on an exercise cruise to Acapulco." This is one of the dispatches which Mr. Roosevelt did not transmit to Congress. On October 16 the President received in person the reports of Capt. Humphrey and Lieut. Murphy. The very next day Capt. Cloman and Capt. Haan were assigned as military attachés to the American Legation at Bogota. On the same day Bunau-Varilla gave Amador his final instructions; told him to sail on October 20, and pull off the revolution on November 3.

Just here it is appropriate to quote from a letter from Amador to his "dear little son," written on the 18th. He says: "The reason for your coming was to meet Bunau-Varilla, to whom I have spoken of you. He said that if all turns out well you shall have a good place in the medical commission, which is the first that will begin work; that my name is in Hay's office, and that certainly nothing will be refused you. The plan seems to me to be good. A portion of the Isthmus will declare itself independent, and that portion the United States will not allow any Colombian forces to attack. An assembly is called, and this given authority to a minister to be appointed by the new governor in order to make a treaty without need of ratification by that assembly. The treaty being approved by both parties, the new Republic remains under the protection of the United States, and to it are added the other districts of the Isthmus which do not already form part of the new Republic, and these also remain under the protection of the United States. The movement will be delayed a few days. We want to have here the minister who is going to be named, so that once the movement is made, he can be appointed by cable and take up the treaty. In 30 days everything will be concluded." The plan outlined by this letter worked to a nicety.

On October 19 Admiral Glass was advised to send the *Boston* ahead of the squadron to Acapulco, and that Acapulco was her ostensible destination only. The *Dixie* was also ordered to embark a battalion and be ready to sail from League Island on the 23d.

Amador reached the Isthmus October 23 with a flag for the new Republic, designed and made by Madam Bunau-Varilla, and a declaration of independence prepared in New York. He at once conferred with his small band of associates. The few Colombian troops on the Isthmus and their commander were subsidized. Those who remained incorruptible were sent away on the pretext of an invasion from Nicaragua.

The news of this alleged invasion becoming public, Colombia dispatched a force to the Isthmus to confront it, much to the consternation of the conspirators, whose only military strength consisted of about 400 firemen at Panama. They refused to proceed unless Amador could obtain definite assurance that American warships would be sent at once to the Isthmus. Thereupon, and on October 29, Amador cabled in cipher to Bunau-Varilla the following:

We have news of the arrival of the Colombian forces on the Atlantic side within five days. They are more than 200 strong. Urge warships Colon.

Upon its receipt Bunau-Varilla sped to Washington. He went to the State Department to urge that vessels be sent at once. As a result, the Secretary of the Navy, on October 30, cabled

Commander Hubbard, of the *Nashville*, then at Kingston, to proceed at once to Colon, and telegraph in cipher the situation after consulting with the United States consul. Also to keep his destination secret, and cable in cipher his departure from Kingston. This is another dispatch which Mr. Roosevelt failed to transmit to Congress in his response to resolutions calling for all information concerning the Panama revolution. On the same day Bunau-Varilla cabled Amador:

Thirty-six hours Atlantic; 48 hours Pacific.

Its receipt heartened the conspirators, who then determined to proceed. Meanwhile, Colombia ordered Gov. Obaldia to send the gunboat *Padilla*, then at Panama, to fetch Government troops from Buenaventura. But the railroad company refused coal to the gunboat.

Mr. President, I have here a book recently published by Doubleday, Page & Co. entitled "The Great Adventure of Panama," by Philippe Bunau-Varilla. The title is somewhat misleading. It should be "The Great Adventurer of Panama." It contains a highly imaginative and almost entirely false account of the history of the Panama Canal, of the insurrection in Panama, of the recognition of the Republic of Panama, and the subsequent treaty which was made with that Government. I have just called the attention of the Senate to a telegram which this man sent to Amador informing him that vessels of the United States—warships—would be on one side of the Isthmus in 36 hours and upon the other side in 48 hours. This man in his book declares that when he heard from Amador he came to Washington, and meeting a former minister from Colombia, and that minister asking if he had had any news from the department, by an inspiration more than human, this individual at once interpreted that as meaning that gunboats had been dispatched, and rushed back to New York and cabled the message to which I have referred.

This is all of a piece with every statement or with practically every statement made by this man whose book seems to have been written for the purpose of absolving all else and all others from any responsibility and of arrogating to himself, as a superman, all credit and responsibility for the events which culminated in the establishment of the Panama Republic. It is worthy of the man. This international reprobate was the prime cause of the disgrace and humiliation of de Lesseps; he was a fraudulent contractor with the company, a man whose career in connection with the French Panama Canal enterprise is paralleled only by the disclosures that have recently been made by the New York State committee in the trust and combination developments of the building interests and unions in that city.

On November 2 the Navy Department, by the President's order, cabled the commanders of the *Dixie*, the *Nashville*, the *Marblehead*, and the *Boston*, the first two to proceed with all possible dispatch to Colon, and the last two to Panama, to prevent the landing of any armed force; that a Government force was reported approaching the Isthmus in vessels. The commanders of the *Marblehead* and *Boston* were further ordered to occupy the line of the railroad if interruptions were threatened by armed force; to prevent landing of any armed force, either Government or insurgent, at any point within 50 miles of Panama, and to occupy Ancon Hill with artillery if doubtful of the intention of the armed force.

The message to the commander of the *Dixie* also ordered him to "Send copy of instructions to senior officer present at Panama upon arrival of *Boston*." What these instructions were has never been revealed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. How did those proceedings, the orders to the commanders of these vessels and the actual occurrences, correspond with the telegram sent by Bunau-Varilla that American vessels would be on the Atlantic side in 36 hours and on the Pacific side in 48 hours?

Mr. THOMAS. The correspondence was nearly perfect. The vessels arrived almost identically upon the lapse of the time which was cabled by Mr. Bunau-Varilla to Señor Amador.

On November 1 Prescott was ordered by Col. Shaler, superintendent of the Panama Railroad, to go over to Panama and "wait until something turns up." On the evening of the 2d the *Nashville* was sighted from Colon. Shaler at once wired the fact to Prescott, and wrote him two letters, in one of which he says:

Have just wired you that the *Nashville* has been sighted. This, I presume, settles the question.

Mind you, this was prior to any act of insurrection, or, in fact, to any overt act whatever, overt or otherwise.

The letters also instructed Shaler to secure such written communications from Amador as would "free us from liability in case there is a failure," and that was done. When the *Nashville* reached Colon, Capt. Hubbard went ashore and reported everything quiet. The same night the Colombian gunboat *Cartagena* was sighted. She carried 500 picked troops, commanded by Gens. Tovar and Amaya. Not having received the Secretary's cable, Hubbard did not prevent their landing. In his report he said:

Inasmuch as the independent party had not acted, and the Government of Colombia was at that time in undisputed control of Panama, I did not feel in the absence of instructions that I was justified in preventing the landing of these troops, and at 8.30 they were disembarked.

But the officials of the Panama Railroad rose to the emergency. When Tovar demanded transportation for himself and troops across the Isthmus, the general and his officers were taken to Panama and assured that his troops would follow at once. Shortly after their arrival the officers were imprisoned, while the troops were detained in Colon. On the 3d Hubbard cabled Washington:

Receipt of your telegram is acknowledged. Prior to receipt this morning about 400 men were landed here by Government of Colombia. No revolution has been declared on the Isthmus, and no disturbances. Railway has declined to transport these troops except by request of Governor of Panama. Request has not been made. It is possible that movement may be made to-night to declare independence, in which case I will—

Here the dispatch was mutilated. The public will never know its ending, although it may easily surmise that Hubbard said he would "carry out his instructions," and prevent by force, if necessary, any interference with the revolutionists. But why was the dispatch mutilated? Mr. President, the reason must have been overwhelming. The bluff old sea captain gave his superiors full assurance that he would execute his orders when the anticipated occasion required it. Mr. Roosevelt could not pose as "the mandatory of civilization" while the archives of the Navy Department sheltered an official record of the sordid and disgraceful conspiracy against Colombia, which he welcomed and made effective by turning the guns of the great Republic upon a helpless and friendly neighbor. The cause which suppresses or destroys testimony stands self-convicted. The arrival of the *Cartagena* with Government troops and the need of circumventing their commanders and rendering them ineffectual disarranged the revolutionary program, which was to culminate on the 3d; and Washington waited for news. As the day waned administration impatience waxed. It finally passed restraint. The State Department cabled our vice consul general at Panama:

Uprising in Isthmus reported. Keep department promptly and fully informed.

The consul promptly answered:

No uprising yet. Reported will be in the night. Situation is critical.

And it so turned out. A very few hours later the consul cabled the State Department that—

Uprising occurred to-night, 6; no bloodshed. Army and navy officials taken prisoners. Government will be organized to-night, consisting three consuls; also cabinet. Soldiers changed. Suppose same movement will be effected in Colon. Order prevails so far. Situation serious; 400 soldiers landed to-day.

BARRANQUILLA.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that this Government many times previously had sent gunboats and soldiers to protect the Panama Railroad against insurrections?

Mr. THOMAS. They had several times used troops to protect and secure the free transit of the Isthmus; they never before sent a force to Panama to interfere with the troops of the Government of Colombia, and always declared—there are plenty of communications from the State Department upon the subject—in their construction of the treaty of 1846 that they could not interfere under the terms of the treaty between the Government and an insurrection, except as might be necessary to secure free transit across the Isthmus, and our Government's action therefore was either at the instance or by the request of Colombia. Now, does the Senator think that that was the purpose of this particular expedition?

Mr. KELLOGG. I certainly do.

Mr. THOMAS. Notwithstanding the fact that when the orders were given there was no insurrection whatever; notwithstanding the fact that if an insurrection were contemplated and these preparations were made against it, then the Government of the United States must have known of the reason and of the contemplated insurrection, and, therefore, must have been in some degree privy to it. Mr. President, this interference in the domestic affairs of a Republic, the guarantee of whose sover-

eighty we had assumed by a treaty, then many years old and always respected, can be explained only upon one theory, toward which every fact and every action irrevocably points, and that is to wrest by force the Isthmus of Panama from Colombia because she had seen fit to reject this treaty, and then to deal with a Government which we ourselves had created, and by that means secure the immensely valuable canal concession.

On receipt of this information, the Washington authorities wired the consul general that its cable of the previous day to Capt. Hubbard, of the *Nashville*, might not have been delivered. He was therefore instructed to wire the *Nashville*:

In the interests of peace, make every effort to prevent Government troops at Colon from proceeding to Panama. The transit of the Isthmus must be kept open and order maintained.

Certainly no such message was ever before transmitted by the Government of the United States to any subordinate commander of one of its vessels. A similar cable was sent to the consul at Colon. Transit was kept open, but not for Colombian troops. We thus prevented Colombia, with whom we were at peace, and whose sovereignty over the Isthmus we had guaranteed, from using her own troops on her own soil to suppress the rebellion of a bare handful of her own people.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. In that connection, I should like to call the Senator's attention to some facts that were developed on the Isthmus, I think in 1904 or in 1905, in reference to the landing of Colombian troops at Colon.

A man by the name of Melendez was governor of Colon at that time, and a very wealthy man. The committee took the evidence there of this gentleman and others from which it was satisfied—and I have never before heard it disputed—that Melendez and other citizens of Panama purchased the commander of the Colombian ship, whose name was Huerta, a one-armed Indian, who was in command of the ship and soldiers, at, as I remember, \$150,000, \$100,000 of which he took, \$50,000 was paid to the troops, and they sailed away—I did not suppose there was any doubt about it—but that the Colombian troops were not landed because the people of Panama, who saw, as they thought, the visions of a canal vanishing, purchased, through blood money, the supposed loyalty of the Colombian commander, Huerta. He was afterwards, too, I might add, as perhaps the Senator knows, made commander in chief of the Panamanian forces, then tried to get up an insurrection among them, and demanded the resignation of Amador and Arias and some other officer of Panama; and our minister, then Mr. Barrett, was in personal touch with Amador, and persuaded him that he could not surrender and yield the Government over to the Indian, Huerta.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the facts, I think, are somewhat different from the statement of the Senator.

At the time of this insurrection a small force of soldiers of the Colombian Government were upon the Isthmus. They were under the command of Huerta, who was a soldier and not a sailor. As a preliminary to this insurrection this man Huerta was corrupted, together with a considerable proportion of his troops. The portion remaining loyal were then sent north upon a manufactured report that soldiers from Nicaragua were about to land upon Colombian soil. After the conspiracy had been accomplished, Huerta received a very considerable sum of money for himself and his soldiers. He is said to have himself received \$30,000 in cash; and, like all traitors, after the money was gone he did become, or attempt to become, an agency of further disturbance, and was settled with quite summarily, and largely because of the fact that the United States at that time was upon the Isthmus and was powerfully supporting the new Republic of Panama.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to inquire what difference it makes whether this man was corrupted—whether we have any better title if it was procured by fraud than if it was procured by force?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the point I wished to make, if the Senator will permit me, was that he was corrupted by the Panamanians themselves, the people who were interested there, notably Melendez, governor of Colon. It is a historical fact, I think, that Huerta, after he was made commander in chief of the Panamanian forces and after he had betrayed his country, Colombia, then, as I said, endeavored to incite an insurrection in Panama, and the United States did nothing to encourage him in it but simply stated to Amador that we were there, and that Mr. Huerta could not take charge of the Panamanian Government and operate it in behalf of a revolution; and Huerta took the money that he had received for the betrayal of his country,

went inland somewhere in Panama, and purchased an estate, where at last accounts, so far as I know, he was living in his ignominy.

Mr. THOMAS. The money which was used for these corrupting purposes came from Bunau-Varilla, and was doubtless intended for that among other objects. I might say, however, that the troops which he commanded—and that seems to be the important point in it—were not those which were afterwards landed, and whose landing was permitted by Capt. Hubbard, who at that time had not received the orders which were subsequently transmitted to him.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does not the fact remain undisputed that whether some of the soldiers had been corrupted or not, and whether a commander had been induced to become a traitor or not, Colombia was by the force of the United States prevented from sending her troops in to punish the bribe givers, the bribe takers, the revolutionists, and the traitors alike? Is not that a fact?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator has well stated it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I suppose that is the point in controversy.

Mr. THOMAS. Meanwhile, the conspirators having formally arrested the governor, who was openly sympathetic, went to the Cathedral Plaza, appointed a provisional junta of three, and proclaimed the independence of Panama. The junta then signed a manifesto. It was their New York declaration of independence.

While these ceremonies were in progress the Colombian gunboat *Bogota* shelled the city, to which the batteries on the sea wall replied. The only casualties were the slaughter of a Chinaman and a donkey. No other fighting occurred.

The manifesto having been read, one Demetrio Brid cabled President Roosevelt that "The municipality of Panama is now, 10 p. m., holding a solemn session and joins in the movement of separation of the Isthmus of Panama from the rest of Colombia. It hopes for recognition of our cause by your Government." Inasmuch as this "solemn session" was the only separation movement then under way, and of which the entire Isthmus, the city of Colon excepted, was profoundly ignorant, Señor Brid's cable is not without the suggestion of humor.

On the 4th the consul at Panama wired Secretary Hay that he had notified the *Nashville* and that troops would not be moved. He also referred to the *Bogota's* bombardment, and said that it threatened to repeat its action. Commander Hubbard also cabled that a provisional government had been established, with no organized opposition, and that he had prohibited transportation of Colombian troops across the Isthmus. He had a hot verbal encounter with their commander, Col. Torres, who very naturally resented the trick of the railroad managers whereby Gen. Tovar had on the previous day been persuaded to precede his command across the Isthmus and was then imprisoned. He threatened swift reprisals, but yielded very sensibly to the guns of the *Nashville*. Hubbard landed a force of his own marines at Colon and cleared his decks for action, whereupon the *Cartagena* took to her heels and fled to Colombia.

On the morning of the 4th Dr. Amador addressed the subsidized Colombian battalion commanded by Huertas. He said:

We have carried through our splendid work. The world is astounded at our heroism. President Roosevelt has made good, for there, you know, are the cruisers which defend us and prevent any action by Colombia.

The events of November 4 culminated in a cable to Secretary Hay from the junta, which I quote in full:

We take the liberty of bringing to the knowledge of your Government that on yesterday afternoon, in consequence of a popular and spontaneous movement of the people of this city, the independence of the Isthmus was proclaimed; and the Republic of Panama being instituted, its provisional government organizes an executive board consisting of ourselves, who are assured of the military strength necessary to carry out our determinations.

A cable to Amador from Bunau-Varilla crossed this one, which urged Amador to try to get hold of Colon, but if he could not, then to hold firm for a few days, that ships would remain on both sides and he would give guaranty immediately. The *Boston* and *Marblehead* reached Panama on the 7th. The *Disie* arrived with her battalion of marines on the 5th. On that day Arango, one of the junta, expressed his acknowledgments to the officers of the Panama Railroad in the following letter:

Allow me to address these lines to you in Spanish to truly express my sentiments toward you. To you, in great measure, the public owes its salvation from the horrors of bloody strife, to you, our constant and valorous coworker; also to brave Col. Shaler and our determined friend, Capt. Beers.

These officials were under the direct control of Mr. Cromwell. They must have acted under his orders. He did not hesitate to utilize their control of the railway, built by the consent of Colombia upon her own soil, to tear her asunder. Corporate rapacity here reached its high-water mark.

On November 6 the Republic was formally proclaimed in Colon. Its flag was hoisted by Maj. William M. Black, of the United States Army, in full uniform.

Certainly no previous expedition had ever gone to the extent not only of recognizing the insurrection but of recognizing it in the person of a United States officer, who had conferred upon him the honor of raising the first flag of the Republic of Panama.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, how many hours intervened between the alleged insurrection and the time of this occurrence?

Mr. THOMAS. I will come to that later. It was quite appropriate, for this officer symbolized the Government whose aid and activity made the revolution possible. But it served as well to advertise to the world the shameless overthrow of Colombian sovereignty over the Isthmus by a President whose oath bound him to respect treaties made under the authority of the United States, which are declared by the Constitution to be the "supreme law of the land." The junta at once cabled Secretary Hay that—

Colon and all the towns of the Isthmus have adhered to the declaration of independence proclaimed in this city. The authority of the Republic of Panama is obeyed throughout its territory.

But the interior of the Isthmus had not then heard of the insurrection. Moreover, a dispatch from the Navy Department, which Mr. Roosevelt also withheld from the Congress, from one of the naval commanders states how he afterwards went with officials of the Government to persuade a portion of the Isthmus to recognize the junta.

Before Colon had proclaimed the Republic, and while the insurrection was still confined to the town of Panama, the junta on November 5 cabled Secretary Hay that it had—

Appointed Señor Philippe Bunau-Varilla confidential agent of the Republic of Panama near your Government, and Dr. Francisco V. de la Espriella minister of foreign affairs.

On November 6 Consul Ehrman confirmed this cable. Within an hour of its receipt Secretary Hay cabled Mr. Ehrman that—

The people of Panama have by an apparently unanimous movement dissolved their political connections with the Republic of Colombia and resumed their independence. When you are satisfied that a de facto government, republican in form, and without substantial opposition from its own people, has been established in the State of Panama, you will enter into relations with it as the reasonable government of the Territory and look to it for all due action to protect the persons and property of the citizens of the United States and to keep open the Isthmian transit in accordance with the obligations of existing treaties governing the relations of the United States to that Territory.

The crowning act of this political tragedy is found in a cable of Secretary Hay to our minister at Bogota on the same day. It reads:

The people of the Isthmus, having by an apparently unanimous movement dissolved their political connections with the Republic of Colombia, and resumed their independence, and having adopted a government of their own, republican in form, with which the Government of the United States has entered into relations, the President of the United States, in accordance with the ties of friendship which have so long and so happily existed between the respective nations, most earnestly commends to the Governments of Colombia and Panama the peaceful and equitable settlement of all questions at issue between them. He holds that he is bound, not merely by treaty obligations but by the interests of civilization, to see that the peaceful traffic of the world across the Isthmus of Panama shall not longer be disturbed by constant succession of unnecessary and wasteful civil wars.

The comment of Mr. Leander T. Chamberlain is here more appropriate—

Thus at 12.51 midday, November 6, 1903, the President recognized the new nation of Panama—from November 2 of the 50-mile order, four days; from 7.10 p. m. of November 4, when announcement came that a proclamation of independence had been issued by the insurgents, 1 day 17 hours and 41 minutes. Beyond peradventure civilized diplomacy affords no analogy of that recognition.

The mortal insolence of this message to Bogota is equaled by its mendacity. Beyond its reference to the friendly relations theretofore existing between the two nations it is a misrecital of the facts. The only "relations" Mr. Hay had entered into with Panama was his cable of the same date to Mr. Ehrman, and that permitted the latter to enter them when satisfied that a government "republican in form had been established." Yet no government whatever had been established save the self-appointment of a junta in Panama City, which assumed and usurped all the powers of a government. Such was the message through which our Government informed Colombia that her territorial integrity had been outraged and advising her to negotiate her differences with her subjects of the day before.

The Secretary's reference to civil wars upon the Isthmus was equally at fault. Since our treaty of 1846, 57 years before, transit was partially interrupted for a total period of 164 days and upon few occasions. And we have seen what the "unanimous" movement was. In his subsequent message to Congress, Mr. Roosevelt said the Isthmus had "risen as one man," and Senator Carmack very aptly retorted that the one man was Mr. Roosevelt himself.

On this eventful day, the junta cabled their appointment of Bunau-Varilla as envoy extraordinary. The next morning this French "señor," in a flamboyant letter to Mr. Hay, formally announced his appointment. His "credentials," which had been prepared beforehand in New York or Washington, were promptly accepted, and through him the canal treaty was at once negotiated. Mr. Cromwell received his \$40,000,000, and as the junta made him Panama's fiscal agent, he also received for investment the \$10,000,000 stipulated as its compensation by the treaty.

The job was finished. Mr. Roosevelt acquired the right of way for the canal from a band of filibusters by bartering for it the honor of the Nation.

Not quite finished. For nearly four months afterwards he patrolled the waters of the Isthmus with our gunboats, and at one time invaded the soil of Colombia south of the Panama boundary in the search for possible invaders of his precious Republic.

When Secretary Hay, on November 7, officially announced the President's recognition of the new Republic, he said:

The action of the President is not only in strict accordance with the principles of justice and equity, and in line with events precedent of all public policy, but it was the only course he could have taken in compliance with our treaty rights and obligations.

And Mr. Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, cast this bouquet at his own feet:

The United States has many honorable chapters in its history, but no more honorable chapter than that which tells of the way in which the right to dig the Panama Canal was secured.

This is a libel upon American history.

This original and only "mandatory of civilization" has also said of the transaction that "we did harm to no one, save as harm is done to a bandit by a policeman who deprives him of his chance to blackmail." But our policeman President was the protector of the bandit and purchased the fruits of his crime. It is far more manly to rob a man of his property than to hire another to do so, and then secure the property from the thief.

The London Graphic very pertinently said at the time:

We regret exceedingly that President Roosevelt has allowed the fair name of his administration to be smirched by a transaction so utterly at variance with the most elementary principles of public law and international morality. We can not conceive a more lamentable outrage upon the public conscience of the civilized world.

Mr. Roosevelt has on more than one occasion since his retirement from the White House been candid enough to admit his duplicity in the theft of Panama. On March 23, 1911, he said:

I am interested in the Panama Canal because I started it. If I had followed traditional conservative methods, I should have submitted a dignified State paper of probably 200 pages to the Congress, and the debate would have been going on yet. But I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the Canal does also.

On January 24 last he expressed himself in similar fashion.

Since Mr. Roosevelt's death Mr. Abbott has published a number of articles entitled "New facts about Theodore Roosevelt," and among other things in the August, 1919, number of World's Work he publishes in facsimile an interview "concerning the personal relations of President Taft and Mr. Roosevelt never before published." This interview was sent to Mr. Roosevelt after it was written, and that gentleman made certain comments in writing upon its margin before returning it. Referring to that part of this interview which credited Mr. Roosevelt with being responsible for Mr. Taft's nomination, Mr. Roosevelt wrote:

But it is so. I could not have nominated an extreme progressive or extreme conservative, but I could by a turn of the hand have thrown the nomination to either Taft or Hughes. The only way to prevent my own nomination was for me entirely to champion and to force the nomination of some one else; I chose Taft rather than Hughes, and I still think I was wise.

I am reading that to emphasize the positiveness of the ex-President's statement, which is nothing if not positive. But his next note, written on the same margin, reads thus:

The mere force of events had made me strike absolutely my own note by October, 1902—

instead of that of McKinley—

when I settled the coal strike and started the trust-control campaign. In 1903 I took Panama.

There it is in his own writing; not "the Canal Zone," but "Panama." If that testimony, supplied by one of the lamented President's closest friends and greatest admirers, does not confirm every fact and every incident of this story, then I am at a loss to know what construction can be placed upon it. There is nothing dubious or ambiguous about this statement nor is credit given to anybody else. "I took Panama in 1903." To say that this statement should be taken in conjunction with modifying circumstances is to say that the notation upon this interview was not as fair and as square as the statements and the positions of Mr. Roosevelt are claimed to be by his friends, and particularly by his posthumous admirers. It furnishes, in

my judgment, all that is needed, if anything more be necessary, to demonstrate the unquestioned fact that this so-called insurrection had its inception immediately after or just before the rejection of the treaty by Colombia, not by the direction or the initiative, but certainly with the tacit connivance, and subsequently with the support, of the administration.

It is interesting to note that when in 1915 Mr. Roosevelt, after commending them, denounced the President because he did not sever relations with Germany when the latter invaded Belgium, Gen. Von Bernhardt was searching history for precedents justifying that outrage. He found but one and eagerly seized it. He said to us, "Your seizure of Panama was only justifiable on the ground that the future interests of the American people are higher and greater than the abstract principles of international law." And Baron von Hengelmüller, formerly Austrian ambassador to the United States, also "finds in all the annals of the nations no such glorious justification of what Germany did to Belgium as is to be had in the brief and simple record of what Roosevelt did to Panama." At last his conduct has been properly classified. He did not overrun Colombia's territory and slaughter her defenseless citizens, because he met with no resistance. Had Colombia drawn the sword the outrages of Belgium might have found their prototype upon the Isthmus.

Mr. President, this episode of our history is humiliating from every angle. But its sordid side is its worst one. For Mr. Roosevelt lent his great influence as President and enlisted the armed power of his country to William Nelson Cromwell that he, Cromwell, might secure \$40,000,000 for his client. He could not do it while Colombia barred his path with her just demands. He could remove her only by robbing her of her domain and of her investments in his company. To accomplish his canal program Mr. Roosevelt shaped the policy of his Cabinet and mobilized the Navy for the undoing of Colombia. At the behest of Cromwell and Bunau-Varilla he divided one nation and inflicted an indelible reproach upon the good name of another, that a private corporation might reach the Treasury of the United States. Surely this was not essential to any end, however important.

A treaty is a solemn convention between independent nations, each acting for itself and in its own interest. But the treaty between the United States and Panama was a farce and made to shelter a crime. Panama's junta, selected at midnight by less than 12 conspirators, were the creatures of Cromwell. Bunau-Varilla, their French coadjutor, was made their envoy extraordinary, by telegraph, as previously agreed, for no other purpose than to negotiate the treaty.

Mr. President, when this subject was first before the American people former Senator Carmack, of Tennessee, took occasion to investigate the record of the man Bunau-Varilla, which I shall not at this time read, but there may be those who hereafter will be interested in ascertaining something of the record and antecedents of this adventurer. They will find what I have been unable to discover has been contradicted in volume 38, part 2, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in the same volume, part 3, on pages 1770 and 2200, respectively, a full account of the antecedents and career of the man. I will, however, read a short extract from page 1770:

Bunau-Varilla, now minister from the State of Panama, but a citizen of France, was one of the earliest and most active supporters of this conspiracy against the integrity of Colombia. This much we know. This man was connected with the old Panama Canal Co., and the official records of his own country, including the report of the minister of justice, show that he was one of the worst of the crew whose thieving operations bankrupted that concern, brought gray hairs of De Lesseps in shame and sorrow to the grave, and covered the French Government itself with odium and disgrace. I shall not cumber the record with quotations from official French records, but they are as I have said.

These extracts have already been published in the newspapers, and their authenticity, so far as I know, is undeniable. I presume that no man here will deny that authenticity. This man is also connected with the new company, a penniless concern, organized simply to sell the wreckage and debris of the old company to the United States for as many millions as it could get, and, incidentally, to gamble in its own stocks. This company was to get \$40,000,000 by the ratification of the treaty with Colombia, and not a dollar if that treaty should fail. As the time fixed by law for the ratification of the treaty began to approach, with every prospect of its being defeated, the stocks of this company rapidly declined. Then it was that Bunau-Varilla left France and came to the United States.

He at once entered into relations with certain disaffected persons in Panama to bring about an insurrection in that Province. The charge is made in a reputable newspaper that Bunau-Varilla agreed to furnish money, and did furnish money, through his stock-jobbing French syndicate, to promote this insurrection by the bribery of Colombian officers and soldiers. The very amounts of money sent by him to the conspirators in Panama are given, the very dates on which it was sent and received, and the names of the banking corporations through which it was paid.

And this is not all nor the worst. Bunau-Varilla engaged with these conspirators to bring the Government of the United States to the support of their conspiracy. This statement is not based upon rumors nor the anonymous reports of a yellow newspaper. It is based

upon the admissions of the conspirators themselves and upon the authority of a gentleman of the highest character and standing, Mr. Merrill A. Teague, a staff correspondent of leading Republican newspapers. His statements have been published broadcast, in the very organs of this administration, and no man has denied them.

At length in the subsequent volume the same Senator details the incidents which I think fully justify the conclusions which I have just read.

Bunau-Varilla was a shareholder in and agent of the company, while the treaty itself was prepared by Cromwell in advance of the revolution. This was the combination which the President of the United States welcomed to his council table to contract for a canal zone. The traveler from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among people of the Cromwellian stripe. But a good Samaritan afterwards crossed his way and gave him aid and comfort. No such good fortune attended Colombia. Roosevelt "took the zone"; Varilla sailed back to France, where he cashed in to the company; and Cromwell—what should be said of him—the archplotter of his time, the manipulator of legislation, the adviser of home and foreign ministers, the designer of successful revolutions, the master of intrigue, the betrayer of his country's honor among the nations? Macaulay turned aside from more congenial tasks to review the career of Barère and "gibbet the carrion" upon an "eminence of infamy." Charles II permitted his harlots to barter with Louis XIV for England's prestige, and Benedict Arnold plotted with his country's enemies for the undoing of his own. The inexorable judgment of history has long since assigned to these their appropriate places in her records of infamy. Her verdict of Cromwell will be made when time shall have crystallized the story of Panama into the stratum of history. And we may be sure it will be as just as it will be inexorable.

Mr. President, for 17 years Colombia, conscious of her weakness and jealous of her integrity, has knocked at our doors and asked for reparation. She has been a supplicant for simple justice. She has asked for arbitration and reminded us more than once that we are its most earnest advocate. President Taft, conscious of her injuries, negotiated the outlines of a treaty designed to meet her claims.

President Wilson took up the good work, and long ago laid a treaty before us for ratification, differing but slightly from that approved by his distinguished predecessor. It accepted the Panama revolution as an accomplished fact. It made due acknowledgment of Colombia's rights and of our injustice to her. It substituted a payment of \$25,000,000 in partial reimbursement of the stupendous losses she incurred through the Cromwell insurrection.

That treaty encountered the vociferous denunciation of Mr. Roosevelt, who shrank from the imputation which its ratification would impose upon him. He would have had this great and magnanimous people refrain from acknowledging his error as their Chief Magistrate by pointing to the completed canal as his vindication. That treaty died upon our calendar, and is succeeded by one which merely makes indemnity. Unfortunately it is all that we can do, and I therefore support it.

Mr. President, we should not be deterred by this or by any other consideration from compliance with the requirements of the national conscience. We preach the doctrine of right as against the doctrine of might. We denounce the German disregard of treaties and of international justice, yet we alone have supplied her with a precedent. In democracy's cause we challenged Germany to the ordeal of battle and sounded a trumpet call to all the democracies of the world. Our cause was that of all Republics. South America knows this well. She thrilled to the sublimity of our purpose, yet she hesitates to open her arms to us. Her people point to Colombia in silent but eloquent inquiry. We know too well what that inquiry is. We can not answer as we would like to, but as we must, for true democracy is founded upon justice. Between justice and our offense against Colombia there can be reconciliation only through national atonement. Between right and the offense there can be no adjustment save reparation. Until these things are done our championship of small nations and weak peoples are as the sounds of tinkling cymbals. When we shall have squared our actions to our sentiments and purged our record from the damning reproach of Cromwellian diplomacy, Latin America will grasp our extended hand, and with responsive good will Pan America will then assume the material proportions of an enduring structure. Our political and economic relations will be close, cordial, and profitable. The Monroe doctrine, reincarnated by the baptism of our blood and sacrifice, has been set upon eternal foundations. When we do justice to Colombia it will appeal to Latin America as never before and be welcomed as the perpetual guaranty of its immunity and independence.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senate I shall at some future time discuss the Panama treaty; but I can not sit in the Senate of the United States and listen to reflections upon the character and statesmanship of Theodore Roosevelt without expressing my protest.

The Panama Canal, the history of its acquisition and construction, is an open book, which has been discussed in the Congress and investigated by committees. I believe Mr. Roosevelt's action is supported by the judgment and the voice of the American people and of the civilized world. Not only that, but John Hay, a great Secretary of State, and Elihu Root following him, wrote the history of Panama and sustained the action of President Roosevelt. So did Secretary Knox in the Cabinet of Mr. Taft.

Mr. Roosevelt is quoted as saying, "I took Panama." Did he ever say he took it from Colombia unjustly or in any manner except, according to the principles of international law, in his right to recognize any country declaring its independence? Does the Senator say that our treaties guaranteed Colombia against revolution? If he does, he was contradicted by every Secretary of State from Mr. Seward to the present time. Does he say that the revolution was an exceptional one? If he does, I answer him that there were 50 revolutions in almost as many years in Colombia.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator point out anything in our treaty obligations which authorizes the United States to prevent the landing of Colombian troops when Colombia sought to suppress an insurrection in her own territory?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; I can. I refer to our obligation to protect the route across Panama, which we had done many times before, and that is what we did at that time. We owed it not only to ourselves but to the nations of the world and to our treaty rights to protect that route across Panama.

I am not, however, going to discuss the merits of the treaty at this time. It has been done, as I said, by distinguished Secretaries of State, by Mr. Roosevelt, and by historians of admitted ability. In my judgment, it is one of the great acts of a great President in a great era of American history. I shall take occasion, when the treaty comes before the Senate, or previously, with permission of the Senate, to discuss it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will, before my term of office expires, discuss this very important proposition, for it is not settled and will never be settled until the United States shall ratify some sort of a treaty with Colombia.

I know that in these days Mr. Roosevelt is sacrosanct. Indeed, those who were most frequently engaged in criticizing and condemning Mr. Roosevelt's courses and policies and politics seem now among the loudest not only in defending his memory but in resenting any statement or expression which seems to reflect upon him. I do not, of course, in that statement include the Senator from Minnesota, because I know that he has at all times been a close and constant and faithful friend and supporter of Mr. Roosevelt, but if anything were more conspicuous than another during the late campaign it was that Mr. Roosevelt, formerly a liability, has by his death become the chief asset of the Republican Party.

I have never said of or to Mr. Roosevelt while living anything that I would not feel and do not feel it my duty to say now. I have always given him credit for many things, for great ability, for a good record, interspersed in many places, however, by acts and policies and opinions and statements to which I could not lend my approval.

I preceded my discussion—and I am sorry that the Senator did not hear it—with an assurance from Mr. Roosevelt himself that whatever could be said with truth and propriety should be said without regard to the man or his condition. I know this will be an active question before the next Congress, if not before this one. The results of the care and investigation which I have sought to give to this subject I have thought fit to lay before the Senate before I retired from it, thinking and hoping that it may be of some consequence, possibly of some benefit, in the discussion which will precede final action upon this treaty.

Now, Mr. President, just a word regarding the treaty of 1846. I think the Senator will find down to 1901 great difficulty in discovering any expression of opinion or any statement made by our Secretaries of State and others in authority which in the remotest degree justify the existence of a right of the United States under that treaty to interfere with Colombia to hinder or preventing her efforts from suppressing insurrection. That is not essential to free transit of the Isthmus, else the treaty would not have provided, as I think it does provide, that Colom-

bia shall herself have the right of transit for just such crises as confronted her in 1903. The Senator will have great difficulty, examine and investigate as he will the fifty-odd insurrections to which he refers, in finding anything that approaches a vaudeville insurrection like this, following upon the heels of a rejected treaty and culminating in the dismemberment of a friendly Republic. And if the Senator can successfully maintain the proposition that under our treaty guarantee to Colombia of her sovereignty over the Isthmus we can find warrant for depriving her of it, or even of recognizing its transfer to another, I shall cheerfully acknowledge him as the most accomplished dialectician and the most competent statesman in the long list of America's distinguished sons.

SETTLEMENT OF WAR LOANS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on Thursday, December 23, I made some remarks in this body relative to the securing of long-time bonds of foreign Governments to which we loaned money under acts of Congress passed in 1917 and 1918 and collection of interest due and past due on such loans. In the Washington Post of December 30, 1920, in an article by the Associated Press, it is stated that the Secretary of the Treasury is now planning an exchange of the obligations due from Great Britain into long-time bonds, as required by the acts referred to, and that the British Government is sending a London official to confer with Secretary Houston in reference to said loans.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point the article from the Washington Post.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The article referred to is as follows:

PLAN BRITISH REFUND—LONDON OFFICIAL COMING SOON TO CONFER WITH HOUSTON—DEBT IS NOW \$4,196,000,000—MODERATE SINKING FUND WITH EARLY FIRST PAYMENT, UNITED STATES WISE—LONG-TIME BONDS IN EXCHANGE FOR DEMAND NOTES VIRTUALLY AGREED TO—DETAILS, SUCH AS INTEREST, YET TO BE FIXED—NEGOTIATIONS UNDER WAY, TOO, WITH OTHER OF ALLIES OWING AMERICA MONEY.
[By the Associated Press.]

A representative of the British treasury will reach this country soon, Secretary Houston said yesterday, to continue in Washington the discussion of the exchange into long-time obligations of the demand notes of the British Government held by the United States.

The British debt at this time is \$4,196,000,000. Under the Liberty bond act the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to effect the exchange at a rate of interest not less than that borne by the demand instrument, Secretary Houston said.

PERMITTED BY LIBERTY ACT.

"The Victory Liberty loan act," said Mr. Houston, "provides that obligations of foreign Governments acquired by virtue of the provisions of the first Liberty bond act or through the conversion of short-time notes acquired under that act shall mature not later than June 15, 1947, and that all others shall mature not later than October 15, 1938. I am of the opinion that, if they so desire, the respective foreign Governments should be given the benefit of the full period thus permitted. The long-time obligations should, I believe, contain a provision for a moderate sinking fund, the first payment on which should be made at a reasonably early date."

Outlining the general policy for the exchange of demand obligations to long-time obligations, the Secretary said the United States should be given the right to use obligations held by it in settlement of war claims against the United States.

Long-time bonds, he said, should provide for accelerating the payment of all deferred interest whenever the currency of the Government in question over the foreign exchange reaches a price approximating the gold import point, and while the exchange remains not lower than that figure, and that if this should happen before the deferred-interest period has expired, no further interest should be deferred.

WITH EACH ALLY SEPARATELY.

Discussions with the British representative, Secretary Houston said, will be confined to the exchange of the obligations of that Government, as it is the policy of this country to deal separately with each of the allied nations to whom loans have been made.

Discussions carried on in Europe with the other nations indebted to the United States, the Secretary said, have not reached a stage so advanced as those with the British Government. The British negotiations, he said, had progressed to the point of a general understanding, but the details remain to be worked out and will be taken up with the British treasury official here in Washington. The questions of interest rates and of the forms of the various long-time bonds which may be adopted are yet to be decided, the Secretary intimated.

WILL REGULATE GOLD EXPORTS.

"The obligations should contain suitable provision for their conversion into bonds of small denominations or for their payment, at option of the obligator, in lieu of such conversion," Secretary Houston said. "To prevent or curtail gold exports from the United States they should contain an agreement by the debtor Government to offer demand drafts payable in its currency at a figure to be fixed, substantially the gold export point, and to apply the proceeds to deferred interest and then to principal, current interest to be adjusted accordingly. Sinking-fund payments should be provided to be made in gold coin of the United States or in the currency of the debtor Government at the par of exchange, if the holder shall so request."

Actual exchange of the securities will not be made at the coming conference here, the Secretary said, adding that the documents of the agreement would probably be drawn up for presentation to each of the contracting Governments before the transfer of the securities is made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Secretary of the Treasury upon acting in the matter. I feel sure that he will act promptly, not only in reference to the

British loan but in respect to all other loans. His authority is ample, as is shown by the acts of Congress, and his powers are plain and full. I am not sure that he is authorized by the act referred to to offset indebtedness that may be due from our Government to England. However, that would be for him and the legal department of the Government to determine. He can do nothing except what the act authorizes.

I want, also, to congratulate the British Government upon taking steps to meet its obligations. In view of her power and prestige and splendid record, I could not see why the matter had been delayed. I hope I may soon have the pleasure of congratulating our other allies on their prompt settlement of their loans.

I sincerely trust that the conferences between our Government officials and the officials of foreign Governments to which we have made loans will be expedited, so that the whole matter may be settled during this administration. It ought not to be one of the matters left open. It would be a reflection upon a Democratic administration that it ought not to bear. I wish, again, to congratulate Secretary Houston, and to express the hope that these matters now started will be settled with all possible dispatch.

ATMOSPHERIC NITROGEN.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3390) to provide further for the national defense; to establish a self-sustaining Federal agency for the manufacture, production, and development of the products of atmospheric nitrogen for military, experimental, and other purposes; to provide research laboratories and experimental plants for the development of fixed-nitrogen production, and for other purposes.

[Mr. STANLEY addressed the Senate. After having spoken with interruptions for about an hour, he yielded the floor for the day.]

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 4, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 3, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O love ineffable, from whose substance proceedeth life, its environments and splendid opportunities. We would worship Thee in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. Home, society, government, and brotherly love wait on us for righteousness, truth, mercy, and justice, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven, through the spiritual gifts of Christ which is life eternal. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 31, 1920, was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WALSH, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of H. R. 7619, Sixty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 227. Extending the time within which the special joint committee appointed to investigate the advisability of establishing certain naval, aviation, and submarine bases in the United States is required to make its report to Congress.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. To-day being unanimous-consent day, the Clerk will call the roll of committees.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER. That question the Chair thinks has not been decided. The rule says that on this day the Chair shall order the Clerk to call the roll of committees to consider bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Whether a motion to take up a privileged bill like this is in order has not been decided.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Unanimous Consent Calendar be dispensed with to-day.

Mr. STEENERSON. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know when it will be in order to take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GOOD. We have some of these large appropriations ready, and I think before long there will be a day or two when matters of this kind can be taken up.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to say that these bills are not factious, but if they are not soon got over to the other end of the Capitol it will be difficult to get action at this session. I have particularly in mind a flood control bill that is very urgent.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that there are some meritorious and urgent bills that ought to be taken up, but it seems to me that when we have a large appropriation bill for consideration, it ought to be proceeded with. There will be ample time during the session to take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not want to antagonize the committee, but it seems to me that we ought to give consideration to the small matters, because it is not going to take very long to consider them.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not object to the request of the gentleman from Iowa. I think within a reasonable length of time we can reach the Unanimous Consent Calendar, upon which I know there are some meritorious and urgent matters, and have them disposed of.

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Now that the Speaker has conformed to the rule by directing the Clerk to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar, would it not be in order for the gentleman from Iowa to move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

The SPEAKER. That is just what the Chair stated he thought had not been decided.

Mr. GARNER. I hope the Chair will not make any ruling until it can be thoroughly considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not.

Mr. STEENERSON. In view of what the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Wyoming have said, that there might be an opportunity soon for the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object for to-day, if it should become the rule and practice of the House to dispense with the calling of bills upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar, all Members of the House might as well kiss Washington good-by except the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman recollects when the rule was adopted?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I recall that the practice under the rule ever since has been that the calling of committees under the rule was obligatory and highly privileged. Members can, by objecting; very quickly dispose of the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. This rule was adopted under very peculiar conditions, and I think if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was here he could relate some circumstances about it. Mr. MANN of Illinois. I drew the rule myself.

Mr. GARNER. It gave us the only right we have to take up bills by unanimous consent, and instead of having to go to the Speaker and ask permission to get unanimous consent to consider the bill. I think it would be unfortunate if the Speaker should hold that a majority of the House could take away that right and privilege which exists now and force the membership of the House to go to the Speaker as they did 8 or 10 years ago. While I have no objection to doing away with the Unanimous Consent Calendar to-day, I should strongly object to a policy being adopted by which the majority can go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and do away with the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GARD. Has the gentleman indicated any time when the Unanimous Consent Calendar can be taken up?

Mr. GOOD. The situation is this. There are now pending before the Committee on Appropriations such tremendous demands for deficiencies—more than \$200,000,000 for the Navy—all told, more than \$450,000,000 for deficiency appropriations. Now, these estimates are not quite ready to commence hearings upon. The bill will be prepared so that we can commence hearings next Wednesday morning. I am making this request in order that the sundry civil bill may be out of the way so

that we can commence hearings on the deficiencies. I hope that no one will object; this is simply a request for to-day.

Mr. GARD. My inquiry was whether or not there has been a day agreed upon to take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GOOD. No, there has not; but I think there will be no difficulty in selecting some time when ample opportunity will be given to take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman's request now is only to set aside the Unanimous Consent Calendar for to-day?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is all.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right further to object, and I shall not object, because I appreciate the fact that we ought to go on with these appropriation bills, I rise merely to suggest this: The Speaker seemed to indicate that this question had not been decided. If the parliamentary clerk will look up the matter, I think he will find that while Mr. Speaker CLARK did not render any formal decision, yet, in an informal way, when the matter came up in some such way as this has come up to-day, he did say that it would require a suspension of the rules by a two-thirds vote, and that unanimous-consent day could not be set aside by a majority vote. I think the clerk will find at least two occasions where that occurred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. That we dispense with the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. CANNON. Has it the right of way?

The SPEAKER. That is the question.

Mr. CANNON. I was not in the room at the time the request was made, but is this a request to go on with the Private Calendar to-day?

Mr. GARNER. No; this is unanimous-consent day.

The SPEAKER. This is a request to go on with the sundry civil appropriation bill to-day. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15422, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to continue in effect the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, not to exceed an aggregate of \$50,000 at any one station, \$300,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revert to page 2, lines 8 to 14, for the purpose of offering an amendment. There was a great deal of confusion at the time of the reading, and I did not realize that the Clerk had passed that item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object. If the gentleman wants to make a statement in regard to it, I have no objection to his doing that.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Why not let us return to the item and I shall offer the amendment I have in mind and discuss it. I was discussing the matter with a member of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee] at the time the Clerk passed it and did not realize what he was reading. If the gentleman desires to make the point of order against it, or oppose the amendment I offer, it will be within his power to do so.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is withdrawn, and the Clerk will report the item referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Remodeling, etc., public buildings: For remodeling, enlarging, and extending completed and occupied public buildings, including any necessary and incidental additions to or changes in mechanical equipment thereof so as to provide or make available additional space in emergent cases, not to exceed an aggregate of \$25,000 at any one building, \$380,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUPRÉ: Page 2, line 13, strike out the figure "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$50,000."

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, as the committee has observed, there are practically no appropriations such as are usually carried in this bill for repairs to public buildings. I understand the exigencies that confront the committee at this time and have no criticism to make of them for omitting specific appropriations. There is, however, this lump-sum appropriation that in a previous bill was carried to the amount of \$330,000, which is now raised to \$380,000, but only \$25,000 can be devoted to any one public building. It seems to me bad policy upon the part of Congress to limit the Treasury Department or the Office of the Supervising Architect to a particular amount that may be expended in any one of these emergent repairs to our public buildings. I really think that the limitation should be omitted altogether. The Treasury Department realizes that this amount is intended to cover all public buildings throughout the whole country, where an emergency arises, and it is not to be supposed that that department will undertake to spend the whole sum on any special or preferred building, but there are occasions that will arise when it will be hampering to the department to be limited to this particular sum. Take an emergency that must be met, where the department asks for bids, for instance. We will say that it finds it will cost from thirty to thirty-five thousand dollars to do the work properly. But, no; it can not accept such bids, because of the limitation by Congress of \$25,000 upon the amount that can be expended on any one particular building. If the gentleman from Iowa would prefer, I would offer an amendment to strike out the entire limitation, but it strikes me that by raising the amount that may be expended on any particular building to \$50,000, at least a large part of the objection to this narrowing, arbitrary limitation would be removed. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think it was three years ago that the committee decided that instead of attempting to pass on all of these necessary alterations and changes about a year and a half in advance, that the Treasury Department should have a lump sum out of which necessary alterations might be made in certain post offices where the work was growing and where the need for additional facilities could not be anticipated. This year there were a great many things that came before the committee. The number of post offices and public buildings is quite large and the investment represents a tremendous sum. We have increased the lump sum \$50,000 over the current law, so that the Secretary of the Treasury has discretion to determine where some change shall be made in order to permit the Post Office Department to properly function. If any criticism is to be made with regard to what we have done it is that we have increased the amount of the limitation. For the current year it is only \$20,000. We have increased it to \$25,000. Personally I do not believe the Secretary of the Treasury ought to expend more than \$20,000 out of this lump sum on any one public building in making those changes and alterations, but now the gentleman from Louisiana wants to have it arranged so that it would be possible for some one who is on better terms with the Secretary of the Treasury than some other man to get a post office rebuilt.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do not suppose I shall be that gentleman in the next administration.

Mr. GOOD. That is what I am unalterably opposed to. There happens to be in this case an estimate before the committee to do some remodeling in the gentleman's district, and it happens that the amount estimated is just \$50,000, what the gentleman has named in his amendment—

Mr. DUPRÉ. Oh, no; it was \$100,000.

Mr. GOOD. This amendment is offered to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to do what the committee thought he should not be permitted to do. It seems to me that the limitation placed in the bill is liberal now, and if we should do anything with it we should reduce it back to the \$20,000 carried in the current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The foregoing work under "Marine hospitals" and "Quarantine stations" shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask to be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salamanca, N. Y., ground rent: For annual ground rent of the Federal building site at Salamanca, N. Y., on account of Indian leases, due and payable on February 19 of each year, in advance, to the treasurer of the Seneca Nation of Indians, beginning February 19, 1915, and expiring February 19, 1991, \$7.50.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if that is the correct date in line 21—"1991"?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it is a long-time lease; it is an unexpired lease.

Mr. HASTINGS. A 70-year lease?

Mr. GOOD. It is a long-time lease, a 99-year lease.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thought perhaps it might be a mistake.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is a long-time lease.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wages of plate printers, at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work, including the wages of printers' assistants, when employed, \$2,086,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of large denominations than those that may be canceled or retired except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes, approved March 14, 1900.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, change the word "large" to read "larger."

Mr. GOOD. It is a typographical error.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical and hospital services: For medical, surgical, and hospital services, medical examinations, funeral expenses, traveling expenses, and supplies, and not exceeding \$100,000 for library books, magazines, and papers, for beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, including court costs and other expenses incident to proceedings heretofore or hereafter taken for commitment of mentally incompetent persons to hospitals for the care and treatment of the insane, \$33,000,000. This appropriation shall be disbursed by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and such portion thereof as may be necessary shall be allotted from time to time to the Public Health Service, the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the War and Navy Departments, and transferred to their credit for disbursement by them for the purposes set forth in this paragraph. The allotments to the said board of managers shall also include such sums as may be necessary to alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several branches under its jurisdiction so as to furnish adequate accommodations for such beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance as may be committed to its care.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. I move to strike out, in lines 20 and 21, the figures "\$33,000,000" and substitute in lieu thereof the figures "\$46,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, lines 20 and 21, strike out the figures "\$33,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$46,000,000."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with regret, because I recognize the proper anxiety of the Committee on Appropriations and the House to keep expenditures down to the lowest possible figure. But neither the United States nor the Congress wants to save money at the expense of the disabled soldier. The bill carries an item of \$33,000,000 for hospitals for disabled soldiers. The current law carries \$46,000,000, just the same amount that is proposed in my amendment. The estimate asked for by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the United States Public Health Service for this purpose aggregate \$50,000,000. Why this amount was reduced I have not been able to ascertain, although I have read the testimony very carefully. There is not a scintilla of evidence to justify the reduction of this appropriation from the \$46,000,000 carried in the existing law to the \$33,000,000 recommended in this bill. If the number of patients were to be reduced, during the ensuing fiscal year there might be some justification for reducing the appropriations to care for those patients. Here are the facts on that point: There are about 20,000 war risk patients now being cared for in the hospitals of the Government. The undisputed testimony before the Committee on Appropriations is that by October 1 of this year there will be 30,000 war risk patients in the institutions of the United States. This means an increase of about 50 per cent as early as next October, when the new fiscal year will be only three months under way. The testimony goes on to indicate that the peak of the hospital load will not have been reached before 1927, and may not be reached until 1929. In other words, the patients to be cared for under this item are increasing every day, and will certainly be increasing for several years to come. In the face of that undoubted fact

this appropriation is decreased some 35 per cent. I can not understand why that action was taken unless it was on the theory that in this present fiscal year certain items of repairs and alterations have been necessary and are now necessary that will not continue essential through the coming fiscal year; but the fact is that repairs and alterations will be just as necessary in the ensuing fiscal year as they have been in the past.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. The statement of the gentleman that the peak of the hospital treatment will not be reached until 1927 or 1929 is a rather interesting statement. Will the gentleman indicate why that state of facts exist?

Mr. ROGERS. There are three great classes of soldier patients who are now being cared for in the hospitals of the United States. There are, first, the medical and surgical cases; second, the tubercular patients; and third, the neuro-psychiatric patients. The medical and surgical class has about reached its peak now, but the other two classes are still mounting month by month. The testimony before the Committee on Appropriations from public-health experts was to the effect that the increase will continue from seven to nine years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the largest proportion exist among those who are mentally disabled rather than the other two classes?

Mr. ROGERS. The disabilities of patients at present under hospital care are about as follows: Seven thousand nine hundred suffer from tuberculosis, 5,200 from neuro-psychiatric diseases, and 6,800 are general medical and surgical cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. The proportion is not very different?

Mr. ROGERS. No; roughly speaking, the three major classes are about equal in number.

If it could be made to appear that the task of altering and modifying the existing structures so as to make them suitable for hospitals has now been accomplished, that would probably be a reason for reducing the appropriation as suggested by the Committee on Appropriations. But in the details of expenditures submitted to the Committee on Appropriations it is shown that about two and a half million dollars are contemplated for repairs and alterations during the coming year. That is to come out of the total expenditure asked for of \$50,000,000, and out of the sum of \$46,000,000 which I propose. I think that the mistake that the Committee on Appropriations made results from the method that they employed in making their calculation. The Committee on Appropriations estimated that it cost \$3 a day, or about \$1,100 a year, for the subsistence of each patient in a United States hospital. Then the committee assumed that on October 1 next there would be 30,000 hospital patients. Then they multiplied the two together and got a total of \$33,000,000, which is carried in the bill. But, as the hearings show conclusively, hospital subsistence is only one of many purposes to which this appropriation is applied. We all know, for example, that the Public Health Service maintains regional offices all over the United States. Those regional offices cost a good deal of money. But the Committee on Appropriations has not allotted a single cent for the maintenance of those offices when it recommends \$33,000,000 as a total for this item.

Gentlemen of the committee, we are taking care of disabled soldiers here. The country and the Congress do not want to economize on the disabled soldier. I submit to the House that if we scale down this appropriation \$17,000,000 without any evidence that a cent of it can surely be saved—or more than \$4,000,000 at the very most—we shall be in a ridiculous position before the country. We shall have the soldier organizations, and the soldiers themselves, and the friends of soldiers, coming to us and asking what we are thinking of when we are doing this thing. And I believe their complaint will be justified. Our Government experts have told us that their task is going to take so much money—\$50,000,000. And without the slightest success in disputing the testimony or its accuracy, this committee recommends a reduction of \$17,000,000. We shall be in a ridiculous position, gentlemen, if we accept the action of the Committee on Appropriations, which, in my judgment, was based upon complete misapprehension of the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is no misapprehension of facts on where the committee acts. Members of the Committee on Appropriations do not get nervous every time some one who happened to be in the late war raises a cry in the press or

otherwise. We have been too nervous in the past. This year we found we had appropriated \$37,000,000 more for compensation for the soldiers than we will spend during the fiscal year. To that extent we made a mistake and appropriated more money than the department can possibly pay out. And so, too, when it came to appropriating money for rehabilitation, the Congress wanted to give all that was necessary to give, and yet the officers in charge of that service come before the committee and say that we appropriated \$10,500,000 more than they could possibly spend during the year. Congress wants to do fairly by these soldiers, wants to do liberally by them, but it does not want to take out of the Treasury of the United States by a large appropriation enough money to set a higher standard for inefficiency and for waste in the Department of Public Health. If the gentleman will closely examine all the provisions of the bill he will find out just what we have done and why we did it. It is true the Public Health Service asked for more money, but they estimated they would have 30,000 of these men next year. That is 10,000 more than they have at present; yes—more than 10,000 in addition to the present number in the hospitals of the Government.

Now, at another place in the bill we have taken care of between 4,000 and 5,000 of these men, and made the appropriations for them because they are in the institutions cared for by appropriations of Congress under the items for the Soldiers' Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. Since the last appropriation bill was enacted the managers of the soldiers' homes went to the Rockefeller Institute and said, "We want the latest, the last word, in tubercular treatment," and the Rockefeller Institute sent one of the best scientists, the best-informed man available on tuberculosis, and that man helped the board to make the plan for a modern soldiers' home for these tubercular patients. They took the home down at Johnson City, Tenn., and they decided they would have to increase the floor space of the porches, for under modern treatment it was necessary to have as much floor space out of doors as there was floor space inside. And so modern concrete porches were built of fireproof construction, and other improvements were made, at a cost of less than \$400,000. They now have a hospital there for 1,000 men and they have the best doctors that money can hire. And we have provided in this bill, not in this appropriation but in another appropriation, for all the money that they estimate they can spend. And the board of managers say that by using only the very best cuts of beef for these soldiers, not buying the cheaper cuts, and by providing the very best of everything, they will be able to give the very best treatment and the very best food for these soldiers at a cost of \$2.20 per day per man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Upon \$46,000,000 the estimated cost per man would have been \$4.20 under the Public Health treatment, instead of \$2.20 under the superior treatment that they are receiving in the soldiers' homes. We have made arrangements for more than 5,000 of these 30,000 men, and if the appropriation for them is not large enough Congress is going to be in continuous session and another appropriation can be made. The appropriation should be, not to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, but to the soldiers' homes and to hospitals where the men are assigned, just as all of these appropriations are made—so much for each home, so much for subsistence, so much for hospital, so much for household, and so on—but at present that is impossible. Possibly after the men are placed in homes this can be done. The Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes has managed these institutions in a model way, and I am sure it is the intention of Congress to give all the money that is necessary to properly care for the soldiers.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. JONES of Texas. What is the necessity for maintaining separate medical organizations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Public Health Service? Why is it that they can not be merged under one head, as one medical organization, to look after the entire thing, and save the expense of two separate organizations?

Mr. GOOD. That is what the Public Health Service, I assume, wants, and maybe it is the thing that will some time be done, but under the law these soldiers are the beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. You might as well ask the question as to why was it necessary before, with regard to the Civil War pensioners, to have examiners and physicians to

examine them under the Commissioner of Pensions. It was to prevent fraud. It was to prevent persons from encroaching upon the Government. And these soldiers are not different from other soldiers.

One of them was discharged the other day after having recovered from the effects of two operations. He was receiving \$120 per month compensation because of his disability. He went to the hospital and had the operations performed, and they were successfully performed, and after they were performed he was pronounced to be cured and absolutely well. He stated that he was well. But when he went out into the world again and found that he could not make more than \$80 a month, or about that, he came back and knocked at the doors of the Public Health Service and appealed to the War Risk Insurance, claiming that he was a sick man. What he really wanted was his \$120 per month compensation.

You will have those problems to deal with, but you must deal with them in a firm manner, and that is perhaps one of the reasons why there should be a medical corps that will be able to determine at all times the question of whether a man shall receive the payment out of the Federal Treasury to the extent he is entitled to payment if actually disabled, and as long as you have lodged that function with respect to the soldiers of this war in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, you must then give that bureau a medical staff to determine the question, just as you gave the Commissioner of Pensions a medical staff to determine such questions arising under his jurisdiction. This medical staff is from the Public Health Service.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS. Would the gentleman explain to the committee why, if \$46,000,000 was the right amount for a maximum of 20,000 patients, \$33,000,000 is the right amount for a maximum of 30,000?

Mr. GOOD. I know the gentleman is interested in this matter very deeply, and frankly I do not believe they will have 30,000 patients. The committee did not believe so. The bureau officials have made many mistakes before in regard to their estimates. Forty-six million dollars was more than enough this year to take care of all of them. This year, the first year under the new arrangement, the Director of War Risk allotted to the board of managers large sums for changes in buildings. For this coming year we are making the appropriation direct to the board of managers for the care of all soldiers there. Last year it was necessary for the director to allot something like \$4,000,000 to remodel these soldiers' homes. That has been done, and that will not be necessary next year.

I know that the gentleman does not want us to make the mistake we did before in our desire to do all that is necessary because there is a demand for more and a statement that we were not doing enough for rehabilitation. We gave for the present year \$10,500,000 more than it was necessary to give, according to their own statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the reason why I asked the question a while ago was that I had an instance called to my attention where a soldier had applied for compensation, and the application was held up for months in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance because of some alleged failure to act in the Public Health Department. I do not know what arrangement they have about transferring cases from the medical department of the Public Health Service to the Bureau of War Risk, or vice versa, or just what cases are handled by each. I know that the medical department of the Bureau of War Risk gave as their only excuse for leaving this claim pigeonholed for many months the statement that the Public Health Service had not acted upon some particular phase of the claim. I do not know what particular claims they refer to one division or to the other, but I can see no reasonable ground for maintaining two separate departments.

I can not see any good reason why the same medical organization that operates for the Public Health Service could not operate also for the Bureau of War Risk and attend to all the cases and do it more expeditiously than it is being done by referring them back and forth between the two different departments.

Mr. GOOD. That is an administrative matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the field work is concerned, that is what is done now. The Bureau of Public Health Service make all these examinations, and their examinations are reported to the medical department of the War Risk Insurance. If the bureau had a separate corps of physicians there would be a duplication of the work, whereas now they utilize the service of the Public Health examiners all over the United States.

Mr. JONES of Texas. May I ask the gentleman whether there are no Bureau of War Risk examiners anywhere outside of Washington?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think not. The Public Health Service maintains its examiners in various districts throughout the country. Local examiners of the Public Health Service make the examinations and report from district headquarters to Washington, and in that way there is a saving of duplication which would occur if it were arranged otherwise.

Mr. JONES of Texas. What is the use of having it go to both departments when it comes to Washington?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the district reports go to the chief medical adviser as to compensation, but there are other matters frequently arising in hospitals which are under the Public Health Service, where they make reports to the Chief of the Public Health Service instead of to the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman's statement carries out my proposition that there should not be two separate services, because if they can utilize one service out in the field more expeditiously than by having two organizations, I see no reason why the reports could not come from the Public Health Service direct from the field and be disposed of here in Washington by the one bureau head. This would enable claims to be passed upon much more expeditiously.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the gentleman what is the origin of his idea that they ever did anything expeditiously in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance? [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES of Texas. I was suffering from the same kind of complaint that the gentleman from Arkansas seems to be laboring under. But I am opposed to delay. That is not the only instance where soldiers have been delayed in receiving their compensation by virtue of the red tape that is gone through with here in Washington. Now, to maintain out in the field, where the actual examination is had, a corps of examiners under the Public Health Service, through which they make an examination, and have that come to one department here, and then have it sent to another department in Washington, is absurdly foolish, for according to the gentleman from Kentucky the Public Health Service conducts these examinations in the field, where the principal work, after all, is done, and the rest is simply done by a reviewing board. There can be no sensible or sane reason why the claim should not go direct to the headquarters of the organization that conducts the examination and there have the work finally disposed of. I am making this suggestion in the hope that this matter may be simplified in the interest of the unfortunate ex-service men who suffer during these almost interminable delays.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers].

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GOOD: Page 19, after line 8, insert: "The allotments made by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Public Health Service for the care of beneficiaries of that bureau by the said service shall also be available for expenditure by the Public Health Service on that account for necessary personnel, regular and reserve commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and clerical help in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, maintenance, equipment, leases, fuel, lights, water, printing, freight, transportation, and travel, and maintenance and operation of passenger motor vehicles."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. The Public Health Service made an estimate for this entire service. They made it on a new plan, altogether different from the present law. We rejected that plan. We propose to follow the plan of this year, so if possible to set up a little competition, if you please, between the Public Health Service and these other hospitals where these men are given their treatment. Now, the amendment I have sent to the Clerk's desk, which has just been read, is current law. That is the provision that was put in last year in order to make the plan workable, but by some oversight in rejecting the plan submitted by the

Public Health Service the plan that Congress formulated last year in that respect was also omitted.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It was not in this place in the bill.

Mr. GOOD. No; it was in another place in the bill, but it ties right in with this proposition and should be inserted here. It is the same thing that they marked out.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does this amendment mean that this allotment shall be available for the general purpose of the Public Health Service?

Mr. GOOD. No; only for the treatment of cases turned over to the Public Health Service by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. The thought was this, that the law placed these men in charge of the War Risk Bureau, and Congress took the position that if one bureau had charge of these men that same bureau should have the appropriation that would follow them when they were sent to a given hospital, so that there could be no controversy or conflict about having the men sent to a hospital and no money sent there to pay for their care and keep.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The language does not limit it to the beneficiaries of the War Risk Insurance. However, if that has been the construction heretofore we may be safe in assuming that they will follow it.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it does limit them to war-risk patients.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the formal motion to strike out the paragraph. I do so for the purpose of again calling the attention of the House to the fact that for every ex-service man the Bureau of War Risk Insurance still keeps three separate files, one file on one floor of that big building that is supposed to relate to any insurance rights he may have; another file on another floor of that big building that is supposed to relate to any compensation rights that he has; and still a third file on another floor of that big building that is supposed to relate to allotments and allowances that members of his family may have an interest in as beneficiaries. If one of your constituents should write a letter to the War Risk Insurance Bureau about any right they may have with reference to an ex-service man you can not tell to save your life, and the War Risk Insurance Bureau can not tell, where to find that letter unless they go onto those three separate floors and make a search of those three separate files, requiring the attention and services of numerous employees in that department. I have called the attention of the director to that fact time and again. I have called the attention of the heads of his various sections to that fact time and again. I have made the suggestion to them that if they would have one complete file that contained every single letter and document coming to that office relating to any particular ex-service man, then they could tell in a few minutes where to find it, and they could find it; but now it takes them a whole day sometimes to search out one letter that has come into their files. A good woman sent them a check back. It was not for the amount that was due her. She sent her check back and asked them to please correct it. She heard nothing from them for three months. Her payments stopped when they had been regular theretofore. I went down there to look the matter up and they could not find the letter and could not find the return check until with my help they had searched for half a day. You can imagine just exactly what that means to this Government. If they would readjust their system on a business basis and have just one file instead of three, they could do away with two-thirds of the space that they now occupy in that bureau. In other words, there would be available for other departments in other businesses of this Government two-thirds of the space in that great building, which would save much money in rentals now paid, and then the people could expect some reasonable definite action on their business within a reasonable time when they send communications to that department. Why they do not change their slow processes down there I can not understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman will recall that under the law these three branches of the War Risk Insurance are entirely separate.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but they all relate to one ex-soldier.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but they are under different heads and different chiefs. Does the gentleman think it would be more efficient to have a conglomeration of all these claims, that are

based on three different articles of law, at one place, than to have them systematically separated?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, I do, for this reason: They are all under one director. When you had some business with a soldier's file you could know exactly where to find the documents and correspondence; but when a letter comes in there relating to insurance it is just as likely to be filed in the compensation department or some other department as it is in the insurance section.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might result from incompetence on the part of the file clerk, but it does not militate against separating the various kind of information.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact: Suppose you had business relating to the service of a soldier that might affect all three branches. You must then go down there and require the services of several clerks on one floor for one file, spend time hunting for that, then on another floor with other clerks, and then on a third floor in another section, when you could do it in one-third of the time and with the services of one-third less employees if you had this all in one file in one place. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I object, Mr. Chairman, as I want to oppose the amendment. I do this to ask the chairman what is the unexpended balance of the appropriation for compensation for the fiscal year ending 1921?

Mr. GOOD. The estimate of the director was to the effect that on June 30 there would be a balance of \$37,000,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think it well to have that go in the Record, because there are always claims that we are not appropriating a sufficient amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national bank notes, and other securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other crimes committed against the laws of the United States relating to the pay and bounty laws, and for the enforcement of section 18 of the War Finance Corporation act; hire and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 18 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, \$400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this amount be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpoenaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts": *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation greater than that allowed by law, except not exceeding three persons, who may be paid not exceeding \$12 per day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 22, after the word "act," strike out the words "hire and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, it has been intimated from time to time by the leaders of the House, especially the majority chairmen of committees, when discussing these appropriation bills, that they were going to stop the practice of furnishing limousines and other fine passenger automobiles to the various heads of the departments and bureaus in Washington. Just go down town at night and watch the street and you will see a lot of automobiles with United States insignia on them going up and down the street. We ought to stop it. We ought to stop paying two, three, four, five, and six thousand dollars sometimes for an automobile for private use; we ought to stop the expense of maintenance; we ought to stop the expense of employing flunkies to drive them—

A MEMBER. Chauffeurs.

Mr. BLANTON. When a Government official has got to have some one paid by the Government to drive him around the driver ceases to be a chauffeur and becomes a flunkie. I think we ought to stop it. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri, ex-Speaker of this House, CHAMP CLARK, sometimes rides in a street car. It does not belittle him to ride in a street car. Some of the distinguished leaders of the other side of the aisle ride in the street cars sometimes, and when they do not want to ride in a street car they ride in their own automobiles, paid for with their own money, and they also pay for the gasoline and the chauffeur to drive him. Why should we continue to furnish department heads and bureau heads with free limousines, free gasoline, free upkeep, free chauffeurs to drive them and the members of their family around Washington. I think we ought to stop it. If we are going to wipe out this \$3,000,000,000 deficit staring us in the face, we might as well begin with the little items, because it is the small items that make

up the big items in the expense of the Government. I know these fellows come and put up a big, strong song and dance that they must have these things; they are all hail fellows well met. The chairman smiles and says we ought to stop this, and that is as far as he gets and it again goes into the bill. This is an upkeep that we ought to stop; it is an overhead in a small way, but in the aggregate with other such expenses makes up a big overhead and we ought to stop it. I want to ask the chairman if he is not willing to stop it. Is he afraid of the bureau chiefs and the heads of departments if he takes away from them the automobile and the limousine service?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item the gentleman from Texas refers to has been carried in the appropriation bill for a number of years. This year the department asked for authority to buy a new automobile. We did not give that authority. The facts are that the Pierce Arrow Co. furnishes one car that carries the secret-service men when the President is out riding in his car, to follow the President's car, and I think that has been the practice for some time. The Pierce Arrow people furnish the car for \$500 a year and replace it with another car. We did not give them authority to buy a new car and only a small amount of this money is used for that purpose. I do not believe in expenditures along the line which the gentleman from Texas has referred to, but I do not believe that in this appropriation there is any great abuse.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How much of this money is to be used for the purchase of an automobile?

Mr. GOOD. None at all; we did not give them any authority to purchase.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I thought I caught from the reading of the amendment that purchase of an automobile was authorized.

Mr. GOOD. No; the gentleman moves to strike out the words "hire and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary."

Mr. BLANTON. That item with the others I am moving to strike out takes in all the expense, operation, upkeep, chauffeurs, and everything else for 236 passenger automobiles this one service operates.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, my recollection is that this appropriation was used only for the purpose of hiring an automobile which carried the secret-service agents who go with the President from place to place.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and when there is a call for a secret-service man he has to go immediately, and if he did not have this car he would have to hire one.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is certainly no abuse of this appropriation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield, how would it be possible for the secret-service men to guard the President, who rides in an automobile operated by the Government, if the secret-service men had to walk?

Mr. GOOD. They would have to be stationed along the road, and you would have to have a pretty good-sized army.

Mr. KNUTSON. And how much would it cost to guard the road?

Mr. BLANTON. How much did it cost to guard Theodore Roosevelt and other distinguished Presidents of the United States preceding him? The gentleman can not make us believe that this relates to only one automobile; the whole appropriation might be expended by authority of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 2371. An act for the relief of Kathryn Walker; and

S. 390. An act for the relief of Peter McKay.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments and for the disposition of useless papers in the Civil Service Commission."

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance of marine hospitals, including subsistence and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under special heads, \$625,000: *Provided*, That there may be admitted into

said hospitals for study persons with infectious or other diseases affecting the public health, and not to exceed 10 cases in any one hospital at one time.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the proviso?

Mr. GOOD. That is not a new provision. It is a provision that has been carried for a long time.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, it is a provision that has been carried for a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, but it is subject to a point of order. It is legislation, and if legislation is needed let it be brought in in a proper way.

Mr. GOOD.* This was asked for by the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That may be very true.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I do not care to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for beneficiaries (other than war-risk insurance patients) of the Public Health Service, including necessary personnel, regular and reserve commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, clerical help in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, maintenance, equipment, leases, fuel, lights, water, printing, freight, transportation and travel, maintenance and operation of motor trucks and passenger motor vehicles, court costs and other expenses incident to proceedings heretofore or hereafter taken for commitment of mentally incompetent persons to hospitals for the care and treatment of the insane, and reasonable burial expenses (not exceeding \$100 for any patient dying in hospital), \$4,080,000. *Provided*, That of this sum not exceeding \$80,000 may be used for the maintenance of home for lepers, including transportation of lepers, maintenance, care, and treatment of patients, and pay and maintenance of necessary officers and employees.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 25, line 8, after the word "trucks," strike out the words "and passenger motor vehicles."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understands that would strike out ambulances.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; not at all. Mr. Chairman, I am going to get to that point if the chairman of the committee will just give me a little time. Under this item, this blanket appropriation, which is a part of the policy of our distinguished friends on the Republican side of the aisle, amounting to \$4,080,000, this department is given carte blanche to spend just as much of that sum as it wants to for maintenance and operation of passenger motor vehicles. When that matter was up before the committee the chairman used this language, on page 356 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. You are also asking for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks and passenger motor vehicles.

Later he said:

The CHAIRMAN. If you had this authority, every surgeon, acting surgeon, and prospective surgeon would demand a limousine from Dr. Cumming, and he would have to explain why he could not take out of this appropriation of \$5,000,000 the small sum of \$5,000 to buy a nice car. This would give him the authority to do it, and the question would be put up to him to do it.

Then later this occurred:

Dr. Fox. We will not need any motor trucks.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you want to buy?

Dr. Fox. We need these for personal transportation. We need motor cars. We are not getting any from the Army now, except a few wrecks.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, you do not want any motor trucks?

Dr. Fox. No, sir.

Later, on page 359 we have a report, required to be inserted in the hearing by Dr. Cumming, which shows that they are operating 15 passenger cars in Washington at this time which they term "touring cars"—not ambulances, but touring cars. They operate 159 ambulances besides in the Public Health Service. This is not a car furnished for the secret-service men to ride around in to guard the President. These are 15 private cars used here by various surgeons in that department for their private cars. In coming to my office this morning I had to ride a considerable distance behind one of these fine limousines bought and maintained by the Government that brought one of these petty surgeons down to his office, which is right across the street from the House Office Building. I could not pass him because his car was going too fast. I was therefore forced to note the magnificence of that fine limousine, with that petty surgeon sitting on the back seat, reared back, a Government employee driving him, paid for by the Government. There is no mention made of any limousines here. They are called touring cars. And this department has 236 such passenger cars besides its 159 ambulances. I saw that limousine with my own eyes, and it had the insignia of the United States Government printed on it, and if they are using limousines why do they not say so? The chairman can not get around this proposition by saying it is

for secret-service men guarding the President of the United States. It is just a question of continuing this policy of furnishing fine automobiles for heads of various departments and their assistants to ride around here in the Nation's Capital. If they want to ride in automobiles, let them buy them themselves, as we have to do, and if they do not want to buy them, let them ride on the street cars, as do many of the distinguished Members of Congress sometimes, and pay their 8-cent fare.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Why not have them walk?

Mr. BLANTON. It is up to the chairman and his party which has adopted this policy.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the gentleman's party has not adopted any such policy.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is continuing it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has gotten back from Marion, the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. MONDELL] has gotten back from Marion, and when the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] and others get back, they may have some light on economy to go by in this House, and they may then see fit, after they come from consultations at Marion, to take away these limousines furnished by the Government to these high-salaried Government heads.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In reply to the chairman of the committee to his observation that it does not apply to the party in power, I want to say as one Republican that I think it does apply to the party in power, because we are in power, and the bill ought to be so drawn, in my judgment, as to limit the use of limousines.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman wants to be practical. This appropriation takes care of every Public Health hospital. We do not say in all of these appropriations that so many gallons of gasoline for this car shall be bought and so many gallons of gasoline for that truck at this hospital, but here is big service, and in all of these appropriations for years past—

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman to permit me to have a little of my own five minutes. My point is this, and I make it in good faith and as a good Republican and as a citizen of the United States: There ought to be some limitation in this bill somewhere whereby public money should not be used in this way by these people who are engaged in public service any more than that the Government should furnish an automobile for every clerk and every Member of Congress. It is a scandal, and everybody knows it. The chairman of the committee ought to be competent, and he is competent enough to prevent that thing from being continued as it has been carried on. I would like to ask in my five minutes of time how much money in the aggregate is appropriated this year for the Public Health Service as contrasted with last year?

Mr. GOOD. Last year the appropriation for this purpose was \$4,000,000, and this year \$4,080,000, for services other than the care of war risk patients—\$80,000 extra.

Mr. LAYTON. All I want to say is that you have a proposition here that started from small beginnings, a quarantine service. It has grown to such an extent that you have 2,300 doctors on the pay rolls of the United States, at a salary of \$2,000 each a year, who are practicing in competition with men and women of the United States who are engaged in private practice. Where is this Public Health Service going to stop? That is the point I want to make.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I can remember the furor that arose on a great many different occasions about the use of automobiles. The House at one time was disposed, in the interest of the farmer who raised horses, to forbid any Government official having an automobile. Think of it! Put down the horses! Now, since the farmers' all own automobiles themselves, and a larger number in proportion to anyone else, it has become the custom for people to ride in automobiles, and a few years ago Congress or Members of Congress, unduly excited because they had seen some Government official riding in an automobile when the Member of Congress either did not have the money or was too stingy to own one—Congress started out to pass a law forbidding any appropriation made by Congress to be expended in the purchase or operation of an automobile. That is still the law, having this provision in it, that if Congress in an appropriation should specifically authorize the operation of an automobile, then it might be done, but without that express authorization no money could be so expended. Why, the automobile is as much a necessity to-day for convenience and the transaction of business as the street car is in a big city. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] owns an automobile and runs it himself.

Mr. BLANTON. And I do not object to other people owning and running them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; but the gentleman paid for it out of public money—

Mr. BLANTON. No; I paid for it out of my own money.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, yes; which he has drawn out of the Public Treasury. [Laughter.] He did not have an automobile until he became a Member of Congress—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I did for years.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Not in Washington?

Mr. BLANTON. I had one long before I ever dreamed of coming to Congress.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman may have had a flyver, but not an automobile.

Mr. BLANTON. I had a Stevens-Duryea, I will say to my friend.

Mr. LAYTON. I think the gentleman from Illinois is not exactly logical about the matter.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Logic has nothing to do with it. The gentleman from Delaware and the gentleman from Texas have only shown prejudice and not logic.

Mr. LAYTON. That is all right, but if the gentleman will allow me to show the logic. The gentleman assumes he buys an automobile out of public money, whereas he buys it out of his salary. What the gentleman from Texas wants is for the other man to buy it out of his salary.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I want.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If he drew the pay the gentleman from Texas does, he would be happy to do it—

Mr. BLANTON. Some of the bureau chiefs, department heads, draw \$12,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; they do not. Some of the experts employed by this administration may draw \$12,000, I do not know; but not authorized in an appropriation or by law. There are a good many lawless things going on now which have grown up as a part of procedure of the war. Let us hope that many of them will be done away with after the 4th of March.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman said that no officer is drawing \$12,000—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I did not say any officer. I said no head of bureau.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I think—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I used language technically, carefully, and the gentleman ought to follow my example.

Mr. BLANTON. I am trying to do so. Did not the gentleman vote to increase the number of commissioners on the Interstate Commerce Commission to 11 and to increase their salaries to \$12,000 each?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. BLANTON. Twelve thousand dollars each; they now draw—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, they are not heads of bureaus. Any tyro, anybody, any clerk to a Member of Congress, except the gentleman from Texas, knows that the Interstate Commerce Commission are not heads of bureaus.

Mr. BLANTON. I spoke of department heads.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I use language carefully. Now, what is the proposition here? The gentleman proposes to forbid the use of passenger-carrying automobiles in the Public Health Service. The first one to complain when some patient from the gentleman's district is compelled to walk or ride in a street car, the first one to complain would be the gentleman from Texas, and a proper complaint he would make. That there may be abuses of discretion at times, I do not know, but the gentleman's amendment is to cut the heart out of the service to meet what I believe to be an imaginary abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON), there were—ayes 1, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, \$500,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that it is proposed to increase the epidemic appropriation from \$355,000, which was the present law, to \$500,000 for the next year. There is one reason which I can readily understand: There may be an epidemic following the recent election. [Laughter.] But what is this money for,

may I ask, and how much is being used now for imaginary or real epidemics?

Mr. GOOD. The expenditure this year has largely been in southern ports. The bubonic plague has broken out in New Orleans and two or three other Gulf or southern cities, and it was necessary to commence to carry on a very extensive work there to exterminate rats. That has cost a great deal of money, and my recollection is that they have expended for this year the most of their appropriation and will come in for a deficiency because of that fact.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, it may be if there has been an epidemic or threatened epidemic in these ports, I was not familiar with that fact, but I can see that is a very good work, but while they are spending so much money in killing off rats the number of rats seems to be increasing everywhere.

A year or so ago, maybe longer, we included influenza in this item. Of course, influenza is always present. Any bureau of the Government can always find ways of spending money for influenza. Is there any necessity for carrying that provision in this item so as to encourage them to spend money?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman they had a separate item for influenza, and we struck that out and put that word in here, so that if the influenza epidemic should break out again it could not be said that Congress had not made some provision for the investigation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, it is inevitable, I suppose, where we ever make an appropriation for a possibility, so as to guard against what might happen in the future, they immediately seize that money to establish a current work and continue it forever.

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And if the emergency arises they never have that money for the emergency. I get tired of this abuse of power on the part of many of the Government officials, but which I think is perfectly natural. They are pressed to spend the money. I am not criticizing them.

Mr. GOOD. They asked for \$200,000 as a separate appropriation for influenza. We struck that out and put in the word here so as to give them authority.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The word was in here before.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; in the law but not in the estimate. They asked to have it stricken out of this paragraph, but to insert a new paragraph with an appropriation of \$200,000 for influenza alone. We refused that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural sanitation: For special studies of and demonstration work in rural sanitation, including personal services and including not to exceed \$5,000 for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, \$50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation in any community unless the State, county, or municipality in which the community is located agrees to pay one-half the expense of such demonstration work.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall not propose an amendment to increase the amount of appropriation for rural sanitation, and I suppose under existing conditions I probably would not vote for one. And yet it almost made me heartsick at times to think of the enormous sums of money absolutely expended, as it seems to me, with an Army too big and a Navy too great, and then refusing to spend a little money where it would make people healthier, happier, and wiser. The Government appropriates millions of dollars to bring men into the Army, millions of dollars for any kind of a naval craft, and then much more to support the personnel of that craft than it would cost to spread light throughout many sections of the country about sanitation and health. I do not think it is the duty of the General Government to regulate the affairs of all the individuals in the country, but when I know the good that has been done not merely by the Government but by organizations outside and the good that might be done in a direction like this it makes me wonder if we will ever wake up and have sense enough to save money where it is not needed to be expended and expended where it will do real good.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I agree very fully with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said. I just wanted to call the attention of the chairman to this proviso, "that no part of the appropriation shall be available for demonstration work," and so forth, except upon a 50-50 basis.

Mr. GOOD. That is current law.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; that is current law, and I very seriously doubt the wisdom of it. The Federal Public Health Service, in my opinion, is thoroughly justifiable. It is a Federal

activity that has done great good. It is economy to do the things that are done by the Public Health Service. It is very much more sensible to have a bureau here make investigations and secure information for all the States than it would be to undertake to have 48 separate ones doing the work in the States. I believe they ought to get information on the various subjects relating to the public health, for the treatment of pellagra, typhus, and for rural sanitation, and so forth. Having gotten that information, I think the Public Health Service ought to make it available to the State boards of health, so that they may use it, telling them "here is our experience; here is the result of our investigations carried on everywhere. We give the information, and the State board can use it if it wants to do so." We put it on the 50-50 basis. What is the result? We have the example before us a little further on in this bill. We appropriated money under this Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, I think it is called. The condition was that this money would be available to the States on the 50-50 basis. Part of that money has been wisely expended, I think, especially that under the direction of the State boards of health, because they have an organization in the States already, and they can administer that fund wisely—that part that was allotted to the Public Health Service. The legislatures come along and they make an appropriation.

Say a State is to receive \$20,000 for its allotment, the legislature makes an appropriation of \$20,000 to match that, but they put the proviso in there that it is to match the Federal appropriation. Now, Congress some day, as we are doing to-day, will find out or conclude that it will not appropriate any more funds. The money appropriated by the States is then not available, because it has been made contingent upon an appropriation by Congress. And the whole service fails. That is exactly what is going to happen under the activities heretofore authorized. As I understand, a certain amount of the \$1,000,000 appropriated under the subtitle "Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board" was to be expended under the direction of the State boards of health on a 50-50 basis. The legislature makes an appropriation to match the allotment of \$25,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000, or whatever it happens to be. Many of them, so far as I am advised, so worded their appropriation that it is not available unless they get the Government's 50 per cent. The legislatures adjourn, and do not meet for two years, and the appropriation by Congress goes out on a point of order, or it is not the judgment of Congress that the appropriation shall continue—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I ask for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. So that wise and very useful activity, beneficial and helpful, fails utterly, but, in my opinion, never would have failed but for the fact that we put in this 50-50 provision to start with.

If we gave the States the information, they would have made their appropriations without condition if they wanted to and permitted the work to go on. But when we held up this fifty-fifty bait they grabbed it, and they so framed their appropriations as to make them available only in connection with the Government's 50 per cent.

I just wanted to call the attention of the chairman to that. I think it is a mistake for the Government to offer to make these fifty-fifty appropriations. I think that money ought to be turned over to the Public Health Service for some further investigation. There are many investigations that they can make, and we should hold no bait up to the States to tempt them, but should furnish the information which the Public Health Service can get much more economically than the State boards could. They have done very valuable work. Get the information and give it to the States, and if any States do not care to use it, they are the ones that will suffer.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I yield.

Mr. GARRETT. I will ask the gentleman if there is not this further vice inherent in this system, to wit, that it not only baits the States but it tends to coerce the States? If, for instance, my State does not see fit to make an allotment equal to that made by the Government, the citizens of my State will continue to pay their portion of the Federal taxation. In other words, in order to get the benefit of the Federal fund, for which they are taxed, they must turn around and tax themselves again through their State agency in order to get any part of it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. I think it is a mistake. I do not think the Federal Government ought to undertake actually to do the work, either alone or in cooperation with the States. I think it should make the investigations and give the States the benefit of them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does the gentleman believe the farm demonstration work on the 50-50 basis is a mistake?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No. From my observation it is a success.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is not this almost identically the same thing, except that it is a health demonstration?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I did not have this rural demonstration work in mind when I spoke, but I think as a general proposition the Public Health Service ought simply to get the information.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What the gentleman has in mind is the Mississippi River. [Laughter.] But still he is making his observation on an item in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would be delighted if the Federal Government would give my district 50-50 on the Mississippi River; but that has no relation to this subject.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman would not consider cooperation by the State with the Federal Government in building highways as a failure?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would not want to swear to that, but my observations relate solely to the activities of the Public Health Service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This appropriation carries \$50,000, which, in my judgment, is entirely too little for this work that is being done under this particular head by the Public Health Service.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. You ought to strike out that proviso.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman understands that \$50,000 will do very little work along that line. The appropriation is made for the purpose of educating and encouraging the various communities to do this work rather than by way of contributing to the real work.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would vote to make it \$100,000. I think the proviso represents an erroneous policy.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman would not get very far with \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 27, line 17, after the word "propelled," strike out the word "passenger-carrying."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, usually the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is very fair, but he has been here so long and has had his own way so long that none of his colleagues over there would ever dare to oppose him in anything, and he sometimes gets out of patience with some of the younger men on this side of the aisle when they take issue with him. He would have the country and the Congress believe from his statement a moment ago that by my amendment I would take away the service of the ambulances that take care of the injured soldiers. The gentleman is too well informed to have that idea himself, because he knows everything that is going on in this House; he knows everything that is in the hearings, and he knows everything that is in the reports before the bills come on the floor.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to what he already knows. On page 359 of the hearings appears Dr. Cumming's report showing that there are eight busses in this service, to which my amendment did not apply, and I made no objection to their use. There are 112 motor cycles in this service, maintained and cared for by the Government, to which my amendment did not apply and to which I made no objection. There are 341 motor trucks in this service, operated and maintained and carried on by the Government at its expense. My amendment did not apply to them, and I made no objection to them.

Now as to the ambulances, there are 159 ambulances already in this service, to which my amendment did not apply, and the

gentleman from Illinois in his extreme wisdom knew it. I made no objection to them, and my amendment did not apply to them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, I yield. If the gentleman wants to apologize, I yield.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I was just going to convict the gentleman of lack of knowledge.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is the report of Gen. Cumming on page 359 of the hearings from which I am reading.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman's amendment struck out the operation.

Mr. BLANTON. Of passenger vehicles only, not the trucks or ambulances.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. An ambulance is not a truck, an autotruck. An ambulance is a passenger-carrying vehicle, and this provided for the operation of them, and the gentleman is proposing to stop the operation of them. That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I think if the gentleman will look into the matter he will find out that the only thing I objected to is the passenger part of it, the part that refers to these handsome limousines which carry these department heads around all over the United States.

Now, as to the passenger-carrying vehicles, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this service is already operating 236 passenger-carrying vehicles. In other words, they call them touring cars, but if you will go over on the other side of the Public Health Service Building across from the House Office Building you will see that some of these touring cars mean handsome limousines. They are all I am objecting to; and I take it that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], whose wisdom and judgment I follow here day after day in most cases, would have been with me on this subject if it had not been for the fact that in about 60 days his friends will come into many of these offices, and they will all want handsome limousines to ride around in, and these limousines can be converted from Democratic into Republican limousines by just the change of officials. I take it that is one of the reasons that animates my distinguished friend in making light of my amendment, even going so far as to intimate that before I came to Congress I was so poor that I had to ride in a flivver. I do ride in flivvers lots of times. I am not ashamed to ride in a flivver. I think the Henry Ford flivver was a godsend to humanity, because the poor people of the country have been able to ride in automobiles the same as the rich because of what he has done. My friend from Illinois should not hit me too hard. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, of course it is not possible for any of us always to judge what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has in his mind, though he very freely expresses his opinions, and I listen to him with great deference.

I am compelled to judge of a legislative proposition by the proposition itself and not by what somebody imagines it to be. The gentleman from Texas complains because the House did not agree to an amendment which he offered. His amendment proposed to prevent the maintenance and operation of passenger motor vehicles in the Public Health Service. That would have prevented the maintenance or operation of ambulances, because they are passenger-carrying vehicles. That would have stopped the purchase of a single quart or gallon of gasoline or the maintenance of anything to do with those ambulances. I can not believe that the gentleman from Texas seriously expected the House to take that position. Now, if he had wanted to offer an amendment covering something else, he has a great deal of ability, and why did he not offer his amendment covering the thing that he wanted to cover instead of offering an amendment to cover something which he admits he did not want to cover?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas refers to what may happen after the 4th of March. None of these gentlemen, in or out, now or in prospective, are likely to be friends of mine; but I hope that the next administration will be at least less wasteful, less extravagant in all branches of the Government than the present administration is admitted by everybody to be. The one thing in this country, all over the land, which made Mr. Wilson the most hated man the United States has seen in years was the gross, wasteful extravagance of the officials of the present administration. Probably the President is not chargeable with the responsibility for that, but that is what made the people North and South turn and end this orgy of extravagance. If this side of the House is wise in its day and generation it

will heed the warning and will stop the extravagant appropriations, and if the new President does not help to run an economical administration he will never be returned to the White House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.

For expenses made necessary by the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910, including the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the commission by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, who shall be the secretary and shall act as the executive officer of said commission, \$10,000: *Provided*, That expenditures for subsistence shall not be restricted by the limitations of existing law.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the proviso beginning in line 15, page 29.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. Not if the gentleman from Illinois makes it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

For expenses of the Council of National Defense; for the employment of a director, secretary, chief clerk, and other expert, clerical, and other assistance; equipment and supplies, including law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; subsistence and travel; and printing and binding done at the Government Printing Office, \$75,000: *Provided*, That no salary shall be paid to any officer or employee of the council in excess of \$6,000 per annum.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of order on that paragraph, and I move to strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not move to strike out a paragraph on which he has reserved a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. All right; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. JONES of Texas. My point of order is that the appropriation is not authorized by existing law, and is an attempt to pass new legislation not so authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I apprehend the gentleman does not want to have the whole paragraph stricken out. I suggest to him that he make his point of order on the proviso.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I make my point of order against the whole paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. What is the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The point of order I make is that the appropriation is not authorized by existing law.

Mr. GOOD. That the Council of National Defense is not authorized by existing law?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It is not, as I understand it.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is mistaken about that. The Council of National Defense was established in 1916 as a permanent institution of the Government.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It was tacked onto the military appropriation bill of 1916, if I understand correctly.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but it is made a permanent thing. I will give the gentleman the reference in just a minute.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The appropriation is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I make the further point of order that the paragraph is out of order because of the proviso.

Mr. GOOD. The proviso is a limitation. Without the proviso they could pay \$12,000 or \$15,000. This is simply a limitation on the power of the commission to pay salaries. That is certainly not subject to a point of order. Now, Mr. Chairman, the act of August 29, 1916, provides that a Council of National Defense is hereby established for the coordination of industry and resources and national security and welfare, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

The duties of the council are specifically provided.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order, and I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph beginning on line 18, page 29, and ending on line 2, page 30.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an absolutely useless appropriation. I believe that the Council of National Defense did some fine work at the time it was organized, and I believe it was an essential and necessary organization dur-

ing the war, but if anyone can give me a sane and intelligent reason why it should be maintained, they can give me more than the Secretary of War was able to give when he appeared before the committee at its hearings.

At the time the Council of National Defense was organized its purpose was to make a survey of the fortifications and defenses of this country, to correlate the facts essential to a national and efficient organization; it did that work and did it well. All the other wartime legislation, practically, has been abolished by this Congress, and since the work of the Council of National Defense has been completed—and according to the Secretary of War's own words it has been completed—it seems to me this appropriation is no longer necessary. Why should the taxpayers of this country be further burdened by an appropriation to carry on a work that has been finished? Moreover, if it carries out the work that the Secretary of War says he wants carried out by virtue of the added appropriation, it will lap over the work done by other departments and which should be done by other departments.

I would like for every Member of the House to read in the hearings the statement of the Secretary of War. I have often admired the clear way in which he stated a proposition. I have admired the cogent manner in which he could present a proposition or advocate a policy, but I have read that statement of his four or five times, and if it has any clarity or any specific purpose it is more than I can understand. Let me read you only a part of it. The Secretary says:

My own notion about the directorship of the council is it ought to be a man of a large imaginative and generalizing mind—

I concede that it would take a good deal of imagination to find a reason for continuing the Council of National Defense—

* * * and that it ought not to be a man who would be especially interested in details or in statistics or things of that sort, but a man who would be brooding over and extracting the lessons from our experience upon the general subject of the correlation of the national resources.

The Council of National Defense is composed of the heads of departments, different Cabinet officers who meet together. They maintain their separate organizations; they have certain duties to perform. This House has passed a budget bill, and one of the purposes of a budget system is to have one single head who gets up a survey of things, brings them down to one point, where we can have intelligent appropriations. Now, if you are going to have, as suggested by the Secretary of War, some one to coordinate and correlate some of these things—and we have heard very much lately about correlation and coordination—we will have to have somebody to coordinate and correlate the coordination in this Government.

What is the purpose of the Council of National Defense? All of the essentials of its contemplated work for the future can be done by other organizations and departments of this Government. In fact, they are now being so done. Why perpetuate a duplication of activities?

Mr. BUTLER. Who is the Director of the Council of National Defense?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The hearings do not disclose.

Mr. BLACK. There is no director; there is an assistant director, Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The council is composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I ask, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Do the hearings disclose what service has been performed by the Council of National Defense?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The hearings disclose that the Council of National Defense during the war and prior to the war—the act was passed in 1916—did certain things with reference to getting information and with reference to finding out what was necessary in order to put the country in a proper condition for national defense. I think it did some very good work at that time, and I am not making any assault on it. But the Secretary of War says now that he wants to continue the work along different lines. He says that great lessons ought to be learned from the war. He says there are things that can be filed away, and it would take all the Members of Congress a year to file them away. He says that there are millions of useless papers and that we ought to have somebody to brood over these things with an imaginative mind. I believe that the action of this Congress should be such as to lead the American people to believe that we are getting down to brass tacks and that we intend to appropriate for those things in the maintenance of this

Government that are absolutely necessary and to do away with the useless extravagance of every kind and character. I submit that there is no reason at all for maintaining a separate lot of clerks in Washington under a man with an imaginative mind who can draw some lessons from our experience in the late war. If there is anything practical that the citizenship of this country can obtain from this organization which this legislation seeks to make a permanent thing of, it is more than I am able to understand.

Somehow, somewhere, we must cut down appropriations. Economy must be the motto from this hour.

You can take the statement of the Secretary of War, which covers two pages, and you will find that I am absolutely correct in my analysis, and here it is disclosed that there are already \$49,000 available for the Council of National Defense. If you adopt this amendment striking out the paragraph, the Council of National Defense would still have \$49,000 of the old appropriation available with which to wind up its work, enough to last until June 1, with the present organization. I submit that if they are now given notice that we do not propose to maintain an imaginative organization, that they can wind up their work and let the American people draw their own lessons from the war, it will be far better, and they can do it with a good deal less brooding than this contemplated director will do. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for just a moment in support of my colleague's amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's permission, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I take the same view of this situation that my colleague [Mr. JONES of Texas] does—that this organization of the Council of National Defense served a very useful purpose during the war, but that to continue it now would only serve to duplicate work and investigation which is being performed in other branches of the Government service. I have here their last annual report, and among the things that they give an account of doing is the gathering of information regarding our leather resources. Without taking time to read the hearings before the Appropriations Committee in detail, I would state that Mr. Ellsworth, the acting director, stated in the written statement which he filed with the committee that at the present time the Department of Agriculture is gathering certain leather statistics and that the Department of Commerce is gathering other leather statistics that have to do with industries, and that the Council for National Defense wants to take the information gathered by these two and other departments of the Government and coordinate it and have all of these statistics together in one department, so that in case of war or emergency the whole of such facts could be laid before the President.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. In a moment. When I read that statement of Mr. Ellsworth I happened to recall that at the last session of Congress we passed a bill that was brought up by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] which required the gathering of leather statistics by the Census Bureau.

When we had the bill up I remember that I called his attention to the fact that the Agricultural Department was gathering certain statistics and that the Department of Commerce was gathering certain other statistics, and I wanted to know of him if that was not sufficient. He replied no, that we did not have complete statistics as to leather, and, therefore, that we ought to pass the bill and require the Census Bureau to gather them, and we did. The bill went over to the Senate, and the Senate passed the bill and it is now a law. Here is the purpose of the bill as stated in its caption:

Authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather.

That is now the law, and I presume the Department of the Census is now gathering data as to the production of leather, skins, and hides and their consumption, and all about them; and yet here we have the Council for National Defense giving as one of the reasons for continuing its activities for another year the fact that they will make a study of the hide situation. What is the trouble now? We have entirely too many Government departments and bureaus doing substantially the same kind of work.

Also they say to the committee, "If you will continue us, we have 43 employees, and in addition to studying the hide and leather situation we will study the question of the transportation of the country." I will submit, fellow Members, that we have the great Interstate Commerce Commission, with its large force of employees and facilities for gathering information, daily studying

and dealing with this whole question of transportation, and I dare say that there is scarcely any angle of the transportation question that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not giving diligent attention to.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. May I suggest to the gentleman this fact, for whatever it may be worth, that the Council of National Defense will study these questions with particular reference to their military aspects, whereas the gathering of statistics in regard to hides, for instance, will be for industrial purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will gladly yield one minute of my time to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. I just want to answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and say that I do not understand the council is making a study of the transportation subject with a view of assembling information for military purposes. I notice in the hearings that it was brought out in respect to transportation that the War Department is making a study of military transportation from its standpoint, and Mr. Ellsworth stated that it was the purpose of the Council of National Defense to study about the transportation of commodities and things of that sort. He stated the matter this way in the hearings:

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The War Department survey is as to the requirements of the War Department. They are not making a study of the other loads which the railroads have to carry. In time of war you have not only to consider the transportation of troops and artillery but you have to consider the transportation of fuel and food for the people—

And so forth.

Of course I think all statistics of this kind are available at all times in the offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and there would be no need for the Council of National Defense to gather them.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Council of National Defense did the real constructive work during the war that may be expected of it in time of peace. It was created just before the outbreak of the war, and the work that it performed during the war was not really the work authorized by the law for the council to do. It is proposed under the law that there shall be seven commissioners, as I recall, who shall serve without compensation, who shall be skilled along certain lines, and those men are supposed to gather certain information necessary for the War Department and the Navy Department. It is known to men who have studied this question that the Navy Department, for example, goes out and pursues a line of investigation to get certain facts. That costs a good deal of money. Then the War Department sends out officials to get exactly the same facts, but nowhere is there a clearing house in the Government so that the information gathered by the Navy Department is available for the officers of the War Department, or the information gathered by the War Department available for the officers of the Navy Department. It is true they ask for a lot of things in the hearings, but if the gentleman will go back to the hearings a year ago he will find that then we went into the question of the real merits of the Council of National Defense, and it occurred to the committee then, without division, and while we wanted to cut off every single activity of the Government that was not producing nearly 100 cents for every dollar expended, yet that here was an agency that ought to result in real economy, and it was the opinion of the committee that they ought not to expend anything next year in an investigation of the hide industry or to make many proposed investigations, and we reduced the estimate of \$225,000 to \$75,000.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. In reading the hearings I notice that notwithstanding we gave an appropriation of \$75,000 for last year, Mr. Ellsworth states that they are going to come in a few days and ask for a deficiency appropriation of \$50,000. Are we going to stand for that?

Mr. GOOD. No. In a general way, when we give them an appropriation for a given year for service of this kind, they must get along with their appropriation, and as soon as the departments of the Government find that the next Congress or this Congress will enforce the deficiency law wherever it can, you will find some of these departments living within their appropriations. Of course, some of these departments are violating the antideficiency law, and we can not prevent that. To prevent that is the function of another department.

But I do think that it would be a waste of money; it would be shortsighted economy not to carry the Council of National

Defense for a couple of years, because since the war they have only been cleaning up the matters that transpired during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, strictly speaking, the announcement was made and there was no one on his feet asking for a division, but the Chair thinks the committee is entitled to a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

Salaries: Three commissioners, at \$4,000 each; secretary, \$3,000; attorney, \$4,000; chief statistician, \$3,500; chief of accounts, \$2,500; assistant chief of accounts, \$1,600; accountant, \$2,250; claim examiners—chief \$2,250, assistant \$2,000, assistant \$1,800, five assistants at \$1,600 each; special agents—two at \$1,800 each, two at \$1,600 each; clerks—7 of class three, 12 of class two, 27 of class one, 3 at \$1,000 each; chief telephone operator, \$1,000; messenger, \$840; experts and temporary assistants in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 per day, and temporary clerks, stenographers, or typists in the District of Columbia, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$100 per month, \$10,000; in all, \$124,940.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice this bureau calls for a great many accountants, typists, and stenographers. How far has the work of the Committee on Appropriations gone in making investigation as to the necessity of employing the many clerks and typists mentioned in the various bureaus and commissions?

Mr. GOOD. Well, the examinations were necessarily ex parte, and officers representing the commission came before the committee and we attempted to determine whether a bureau or department could get along with less clerks, whether they are fairly efficient and all that. They usually come and plead that they have not sufficient clerks; that their clerks are efficient; and that they want more clerks and more pay.

Mr. WATSON. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that a stenographer was in my office and stated that her average day's work was writing four letters a day. Does the committee think that is sufficient energy displayed for eight hours' work?

Mr. GOOD. Who is that?

Mr. WATSON. A clerk in one of the departments. Also, another complained because there is not enough work to do and he was idle part of the time. It is all very well to save millions here and millions there, but it seems to me we ought to make an investigation and endeavor to create a spirit of economy in the various departments.

Mr. GOOD. So far as this item is concerned, I will say to the gentleman, in 1917 there was \$550,000 paid out as compensation to employees who were injured. During the present year they have an appropriation of \$2,654,000. Now, that work has been growing, and during the past year or two we have not given them any increased force, and in this bill, as I recall, we do not give them any increase of force at all, so far as stenographers and clerks are concerned. The amount to be expended next year for the compensation fund can be reduced somewhat from the amount carried in the bill. But the gentleman must know that that is a purely administrative thing. Whether or not a department has too many clerks, whether or not heads of bureaus violate the spirit of the law with regard to the use of automobiles and things of that kind, are all purely administrative.

Every effort that you may make to safeguard the Treasury, if the administrative head is inefficient, if he is wasteful, if he wants to violate the spirit of the law, is a failure if the administrative official is not efficient. It is impossible to enact a statute that will make a good official out of a poor one. It is an administrative matter, and I believe if in some of these departments we can get good administrative officials we can discharge many of these clerks. Take this very commission. The president of the commission is mad because the two other commissioners have ruled against him, and now he goes to the office of the commission only about once a month to draw his salary, and he does nothing. He has taken, as I recall, \$200 or \$300 of transportation script, which he has failed to return; and how in the name of common sense can the Congress right that wrong? The President's attention was called to it in a letter dated July 12 of last year stating that the commission was not functioning, but the President being sick nothing

was done. Until the President acts we will only drift. Now, they may have too many clerks; I do not know. And so I say in other departments of the Government there is no way by which Members of Congress can tell just how many clerks are necessary to do a certain thing. What is needed is administrative efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation provided by "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, including medical, surgical, and hospital services, and supplies provided by section 9, and the transportation and burial expenses provided by sections 9 and 11, \$2,200,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 19, change "\$2,200,000" to read "\$2,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, that was the intention of the committee, but by an oversight the reduction was not made, but in the course of the hearings they say they can get along next year with \$2,000,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I notice this item is to remain available until expended. There may have been some reason for that at one time or another, but this is for the current use of money?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Now, does not the gentleman from Iowa know that it is a bad policy to make current appropriations available until expended?

Mr. GOOD. I think as a general rule it is not wise and there is no very good reason for it here. In fact there is no real reason for a commission to administer a law like this. One officer could administer as well as the commission, but here is a law that fixes the exact amount, and I have no objections as far as I am personally concerned to those words going out.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, by striking out, in line 19, page 31, the language "to remain available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will offer mine after the other amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Page 31, line 19, after the figures "\$2,200,000" strike out "to remain available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, funeral and other incidental expenses (including transportation of remains) of deceased trainees of the board; printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office; law books, books of reference, and periodicals: \$65,000,000, together with the unexpended balances of the appropriations for this purpose for the fiscal years 1920 and 1921, of which sums not exceeding \$5,000 may be expended for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia if space is not provided by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided*, That the salary limitations placed upon the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 19, 1919, modified as provided by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 5, 1920, shall apply to the appropriation herein made.

Mr. FESS and Mr. CHINDBLOM rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FESS: Page 32, line 8, after the figures "1921," insert the following: "of which sum not exceeding \$500,000 may be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education as a revolving fund for the purpose of making loans and advancements to persons commencing or undergoing training under the vocational rehabilitation act, such loans or advancements to bear no interest and

to be repaid in such installments as may be determined by the Federal board by proper deductions from the monthly maintenance and support allowance allowed by said act as amended."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that, I shall not make it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the committee to this item, which I will concede is subject to a point of order if the point of order is made, but I think the committee would like to have it put in. In the administration of the rehabilitation work there were many applicants for rehabilitation that were entirely without funds, and therefore had to rely upon some outside help to get them started, since the Government could pay nothing until the service was rendered. We did not provide for it in the original rehabilitation act because we did not foresee that situation. There was a provision, however, in the rehabilitation act to allow the board to receive donations or loans, a matter that some of us thought was more or less questionable at the time, and yet which proved to be of very great importance later on. We found in the administration of the act that a great number of disabled men could not enter because of a lack of funds. Under this provision of the law permitting the board to accept loans or donations the Order of Elks took up this work and loaned to the board \$200,000 to be used for this particular purpose. At one time they made an outright donation. Later on they found that the administration was of great importance. Therefore they proceeded with loans, and when we had this investigation of the work of the board the head of the Elks appeared there under solicitation and made a very remarkably important statement of the work of the Elks in connection with this work. He stated that the records at the time, on February 28 of the year 1919, showed there were approximately 26,000 boys in training. He showed there had been 22,574 separate cases in which these boys had received financial assistance from the Elks' fund. The total amount loaned up to the time was \$404,340.80, of which amount up to that time had been repaid \$263,587.64.

The need of this would come about in this way. A boy would need clothing, or he did not have the ready money, and would have to borrow it or else depend upon charity, or else be deprived of the training for the first month. Therefore the Elks' fund was offered to bridge him over. There were other cases where other things were needed that would shut the boys out. The representative of the Elks' fund stated that the Order of Elks did not care to continue this unless the Congress did not see fit to come in and satisfy the needs. He stated, as many other members of the committee stated, that that item had been overlooked. No one had foreseen it. Congress did not want to be put in the position that some outside order would have to be called upon to supply in form of loans a certain amount of money to make effective the administration of this particular law. The Order of Elks has withdrawn its further support. The board has no fund except what is appropriated regularly. This appropriation that this item carries is sufficient—\$65,000,000, as stated by the chairman of the committee. I think there is no question about that. But we ask that you direct \$500,000 of that money to be used as a revolving fund, out of which they can loan or advance, with the understanding that it is to be returned whenever they can pay it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. I would like one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. Our past experience is not discomfiting. It has been returned. I said that this, of course, is subject to a point of order. If it is made, it can not be resisted; it will have to go out, but I seriously hope this feature will be allowed to remain in the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it intended that this money shall be loaned only to those who take training, so that the payment shall be made out of the subsequent compensation to them?

Mr. FESS. Yes; it is limited to those who take training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. When this matter was presented the committee was advised that out of the Elks' fund there had been altogether about 22,000 loans made, and loans had been made to something like 12,000 of the soldiers that were taking this training. The committee called the attention to those at the head of this organization to the fact that there was no authority of law

for the provision which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] has submitted in his amendment. And the Committee on Appropriations has scrupulously avoided the placing of new legislation upon this bill when that could be avoided and the Treasury protected. Some legislation has been necessary, as heretofore, in the administration of the appropriation, but further than that we have not attempted to enlarge upon the legislative scope of the bill. Now, the committee was also advised that the Order of Elks would withdraw the support at once. They felt that they had other need for their funds.

An officer came to the committee, and we labored with him, and we said to him that we understood this matter was to be presented to the legislative committee; that possibly there would be some legislation; that there ought to be no change at least until the beginning of the next year. With that understanding I supposed that the matter would either be taken up by the Committee on Education or would be offered here; and personally, while it is subject to a point of order, I do not intend to make it, because I assume that committee has taken the matter up and done what the Committee on Appropriations did not do, and that is, to go into the merits of the case, to see whether or not the loans of this kind are for the best interests of the men and of the Government. I personally do not care to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa withdraws the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. FESS. The committee did make an investigation of that kind and wants it to be continued.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to have any extensive knowledge on this subject, but I think an item to loan money to an individual without security in the form of national funds, no matter who the individual is, which goes through Congress as a matter of course and without consideration, would have a tendency to be rather disastrous to the National Treasury. It may be that after careful consideration of the subject we ought to engage in such an enterprise, but I can imagine nothing more wasteful or extravagant than to start in on such a course, which is demanded by every poor man in the country.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. In just a second. I did not interrupt the gentleman. That the Government should loan him money without security. Most of them say, "If I had security, I could get it anyway." I admit that we owe a greater debt to the men who served in the Army and Navy than to those who stayed at home.

Now I yield to my friend.

Mr. FESS. I agree entirely with the gentleman in that statement, that it is an awfully bad policy. The only protection that we have here is that the Government pays this boy a certain amount per month and we can take the money from the payment. Therefore it is a security. You see the Government pays him for his subsistence a hundred dollars a month, and if married \$120 a month.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the Government is paying him the money which he has to turn back, he does not need a loan.

Mr. FESS. He does not get it until he starts in.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He never will get all of it. The moment you commence it, it will be used here as an illustration, and you will hear it every day. Every poor farmer in the country—I will not say every one, because some of them have too much sense—and every poor laborer wants to borrow money out of the Treasury; everywhere in the world the man who has not got anything wants to borrow money without security. It may be that we ought to do it, but we ought not to do it without consideration. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] knows about this matter. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] says he knows about the matter.

Mr. GOOD. No; that is not quite what I said.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Elks know about the matter. The Members of this House do not know about the matter. Let it be brought up in an orderly way, where the Members can give consideration to the merits of the proposition, and, if they want, let them differentiate it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, instead of this being a loan to the boys, it is really an advance to them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. All I know about it is that it is denominated a loan without interest.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. That is an improper designation. It is advanced to the boys, because our Government is slow in getting to them the money that is due them. This is an advance to keep them living until they get their money.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order on the amendment. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FESS. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct attention to lines 7 and 8. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to ask the gentleman how much of the unexpended balance of the appropriation referred to there will be at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. GOOD. Ten million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if the amount covered by this bill is the estimate; and if not, how much deficiency there is likely to be?

Mr. GOOD. It is almost the estimate, with the unexpended balance. The amount estimated was \$78,000,000, and they figure now that there will be an unexpended balance of \$10,500,000, leaving about \$67,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman thinks it unlikely that there will be any deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. I should rather judge so, because they overestimated it by \$10,500,000 last year, and we have given them within three million of what they estimated.

Mr. HASTINGS. How much did we give them last year?

Mr. GOOD. Forty-six million dollars.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa, What does he think about the efficiency of this vocational board, anyhow?

Mr. GOOD. When the committee that had to do with the subject went into the question of the efficiency of this organization the Committee on Appropriations retired from that field of activity and gave no further consideration to the question of efficiency. I have regarded the work done by this board as a great work. I have felt at times that it was not measuring up to the full measure of responsibility which Congress placed on it; that it was in a way wasteful; that its methods were not practical; and I think my opinion in that respect has been partly, at least, sustained by the findings of the Committee on Education, that did investigate the workings of the board.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just how long does he think the Treasury will be able to stand the strain of these fellows in charge of this bureau if they are allowed all the money they ask and are allowed to spend it in the way they want to spend it and keep up the system of appearing to want to make a showing more in numbers of men treated in that bureau than in the kind of treatment that the men get?

Mr. GOOD. I am afraid this whole system is going to come to its test if we should have a period of unemployment, because then a great number of ex-soldiers will want to take training; a great many that will not be strictly entitled to training will want to take it because of the compensation allowed.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will they not do that if the invitation is constantly held out to them by a bureau that wants to make a showing simply in numbers instead of in the character of work done?

Mr. GOOD. That may be true; but after all, I believe this is one of the best works that the Government can engage in, to rehabilitate these men.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; if the work were done as Congress intended it to be done; but I do not think anybody will contend for a moment that this vocational board is doing its work in the way that Congress intended it to do it.

Mr. GOOD. That may be so.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Federal Power Commission as authorized by law, including not exceeding \$500 for books of reference and periodicals, \$100,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. SNELL. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee in regard to this Federal Power Commission. As I understand, this is the commission created under the water power act passed last year.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. Just what is this commission doing at the present time?

Mr. ESCH. If the gentleman will allow me, I can answer that question.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who perhaps has kept more closely in touch with the work of this commission than I have.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Power Commission was organized shortly after the enactment of the water power bill. It is composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of Agriculture, and Secretary of the Interior. They have established a personnel within the limits of the appropriation, which is only \$100,000. Since they have been organized there have been 134 applications for water-power development in the United States, aggregating possibly 10,000,000 horsepower. The trouble is that with the small personnel allowed under the small appropriation they are not able to make the preliminary surveys and thus expedite the construction of water-power plants. We have a bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce upon which a hearing will be had possibly this week, the purpose of which is to try and meet that situation.

Mr. SNELL. What I had in mind was to find out how much they intended to expend, and how large an organization would be necessary in order for them to supervise and carry out the provisions of the act properly.

Mr. ESCH. When we passed the original act we thought they might get along by having transferred to them the engineering personnel of the three departments, but we have found in actual experience that the engineering forces of those three departments are so much taken up with their own work that they can give little or no attention to the water-power commission.

Mr. SNELL. I noticed in reading the hearings that that was the condition which was stated to exist, but I supposed that we had plenty of engineers in connection with the War Department who could make the necessary preliminary estimates to be presented to this commission.

Mr. ESCH. We have not. One engineer officer has been detailed to act with the water-power commission.

Mr. SNELL. I take it from the hearings that they think it necessary to have a personnel costing perhaps half a million dollars a year to do this work.

Mr. ESCH. Very likely, but the gentleman must remember that under the water power act we authorized the commission to make charges for the development of water power, and that will develop a fund which will meet this expense.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman thinks that eventually we will get enough return to meet that?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. And the gentleman thinks it is necessary to have so large a personnel?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; and unless it is created soon, all water-power development will be deferred.

Mr. SNELL. But we are not going to get the help out of the departments that we expected we would get?

Mr. ESCH. No; we are not.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I wanted to find out. Of course, I want the commission to be able to do the work required, but am sorry it will be necessary to spend quite so much money for additional engineers, and so forth, when we have so many now in the Government employ.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CHINDBLOM: Page 32, at the end of line 24, insert: "Provided further, That no portion of this appropriation shall be available for any expense connected with the leasing for private use of any water-power facilities in any national park."

Mr. GOOD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I think the attention of all of us has been called to the situation with reference to the leasing of water power in the national parks. I believe quite inadvertently on the part of most of us the water-power bill was allowed to pass containing provisions which render it possible for water power in the national parks to be commercialized. At the present time the only thing which prevents such a course of action is the position taken by the Water Power Commission, who have declared it, as I understand, to be their purpose not to permit the leasing or development of water power in the national parks for private uses. However, there is a widespread apprehension that the mere announcement of a policy by the present Water Power Commission is not a sufficient guaranty against the possibility of such use of water power in the national parks.

In addition to that, we all know that there are bills pending here which appear constantly upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, to which vigilant objections must be made in order to

prevent their consideration and whose direct purpose is to authorize the use of the water power in the national parks for commercial purposes. I think the apprehension which is felt so extensively throughout the country would be allayed by the adoption of this amendment, establishing the policy that the Congress does not intend that the natural resources in the national parks shall be commercialized for private use.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I notice the gentleman uses the word "private." Does he want to include municipal uses?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Suppose some city or village or municipality wanted to have a lease of water power or wanted to get water-power privileges, is the gentleman's amendment broad enough to cover that?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think it is. I think that, as far as the National Government is concerned, use for a municipality would be a private use.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a provision in the law that exempts municipalities from the payment of fees.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, yes.

Mr. MADDEN. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; but I think this amendment would prevent the use of water power in national parks by a municipality as well as by individuals and private corporations.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The question would be whether the municipal use would be a public use or private use. That would be a question of construction.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If there is any doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out the words "for private use."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment so that it will read as follows: Page 32, line 24, after the word "commission," insert "Provided further, That no portion of this appropriation shall be available for any expense connected with the leasing of any water-power facilities in any national park."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. McKENZIE. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is it the purpose of my colleague to prevent the development of any water power that might happen to exist in the national parks?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Exactly; not only to prevent developing it but to prevent leasing it, so that the parks may not be commercialized for that purpose. I will say this, that if representatives of the National Government find it necessary to develop some power for their own use within the park, that would not come within the amendment, but any development of any water power in any national park to be utilized and extended outside of the park would come within the prohibition.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman's object is to prevent the utilization of water power that may exist in national parks that could be used for the benefit of a citizen of this country who might make use of it, and to preserve the park for the benefit of those who may go there to see the park?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My object is to have the national parks maintained for their natural scenery.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois to modify his amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by adding to it the words "and national monuments."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each; secretary, \$5,000; in all, \$55,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move pro forma to strike out the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, this provides for the salary of five commissioners at \$10,000 each. In my efforts a moment ago to try to get Congress to cease the policy of giving high-salaried Government employees hundreds of automobiles and maintaining them at Government expense all over the United States, unfortunately I referred to them as department heads and bureau chiefs. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, in playing upon words, tried to draw a legal distinction between tweedledum and tweedledee and called attention to the fact that there were no bureau chiefs drawing such high salaries.

The people of the United States think of the high-salaried officers of the United States Government and of the department

heads as heads of bureaus, regardless of what bureaus mean to the Members of Congress. We know that there are 10 departments of Government, and at the head of each is a Secretary, a member of the Cabinet, drawing a salary of \$12,000 a year. That was the point I was making when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois intimated that if the employees of the Government drew as much salary as the gentleman from Texas, to wit, \$7,500 a year, they could buy their own automobiles, and yet the very point I was making was that many of the ones who are furnished automobiles are drawing more than a Member of Congress—the heads of our 10 departments are drawing \$12,000 apiece. I did not have opportunity then, but I tried to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that in this very bill he was seeking to renew the salaries of various individuals at high figures which he, by his vote, had caused to be fixed at high figures.

Now, I want to call attention to some of these high salaries in this bill. Five commissioners of the Federal Trade Commission, at \$10,000 a year each. Eleven members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, at \$12,000 a year each. Nine members of the Railroad Labor Board, at \$10,000 a year each. Seven members of the Shipping Board, at \$12,000 a year each. Six members of the Tariff Commission, at \$7,500 a year each.

I do this only to prevent the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois from absolutely squelching me in the Record, for when the gentleman from Illinois jumps on a man on the floor the man usually had better take his medicine and sit down. I am not so timid as some of my colleagues, for I will answer the distinguished gentleman, although I do it at a great disadvantage.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is the last man in the House whom I would seek to squelch or whom I desire to keep still. I think he is a valuable man in the House in talking and working, although sometimes I think he talks too much. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Having gotten the record straight, I will take the gentleman's advice and quit. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; traveling expenses of members and employees; office supplies, printing, and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, and construction of additional buildings necessary in connection therewith; maintenance and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; and purchase, maintenance, and operation of one passenger-carrying motor cycle; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for clerical, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, shall not exceed \$50,000; in all, \$260,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I do not know whether it is provided for by law or not. I do not know when this was named the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory. That probably may be a very good name.

Mr. GOOD. It is authorized by the naval act for the year 1916. It is a permanent authorization.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. For what? For a national advisory committee? But I take it not for all of the purposes named in this paragraph—certainly not all of them. Outside of that I would like to ask a question. I know this is said to be scientific work, and I would like the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] for a moment. Here is the proposition: We have now an aeronautical service in the Navy, an aeronautical service in the Army, an aeronautical service in the Post Office Department, and a proposition for an aeronautical service under the Smithsonian Institution, or wherever it is to be—under a special permit. I suppose all of these services do some good, and yet there is no one who does not know there might be some combination between these different services, but instead of having a combination we have a tendency to separate and spread out still more. These are not the only ones who are doing this work. Why can not this be stopped? The war is not going on, and while the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] may later report upon this subject, I should think he would now have enough information to know that it is not necessary to have four branches of the Government working at the same thing.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. I have information enough to tell the gentleman that through the kindness of the President in losing the

resolution for reorganization, this thing can be stopped, and that the purpose of the resolution was to appoint a committee to ascertain wherein these foolishly expensive duplications consisted.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What does the gentleman mean by the President "losing" the resolution?

Mr. REAVIS. The press had it that the resolution for reorganization became a law because the President "lost" it, until after the 10 days had expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, I thought the gentleman meant that the resolution had been really lost. If it is a press story, then it ought not to be taken seriously. The President allowed the gentleman to function, and that is the most thankful thing that the gentleman can find in any of the President's recent actions.

Mr. REAVIS. The President has not allowed the gentleman to function, because he has no particular desire to do so; but the President has doubtless allowed the commission to function, which I hope will bring something before the Congress that will answer the gentleman's question about why these duplications can not stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman from Nebraska in his investigation, which covers all branches of the Government service, will probably not find any in the thousands of services investigated to which he will be able to give as much needed attention as he can to these four plain cases right now.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. I will state to the gentleman that with reference to the duplication of these various services on aeronautics, three of them have already been to me to assure me of the utter necessity of each particular service being continued, and not being done away with.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And the fourth one is in this bill.

Mr. REAVIS. Probably they have not yet had time to reach me.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, undoubtedly they have a good friend somewhere.

Mr. REAVIS. But they are on their way.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether there is any hope of ever stopping any of the duplications, but I make the point of order anyway.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is a good place to stop it right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order on the paragraph. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point?

Mr. GOOD. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That it is not authorized by law. Of course, there are special things in the paragraph that are subject to a point of order, but I will not take them up separately.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the naval appropriation act, approved March 3, 1915, contains the following provision:

An advisory committee for aeronautics is hereby established, and the President is authorized to appoint not to exceed 12 members, to consist of two members from the War Department, from the office in charge of military aeronautics; two members from the Navy Department, from the office in charge of naval aeronautics; a representative each of the Smithsonian Institution, of the United States Weather Bureau, and of the United States Bureau of Standards; together with not more than five additional persons who shall be acquainted with the needs of aeronautical science, either civil or military, or skilled in aeronautical engineering or its allied sciences: *Provided*, That the members of the advisory committee for aeronautics, as such, shall serve without compensation: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of the advisory committee for aeronautics to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solution, and to determine the problems which should be experimentally attacked, and to discuss their solution and their application to practical questions. In the event of a laboratory or laboratories, either in whole or in part, being placed under the direction of the committee, the committee may direct and conduct research and experiment in aeronautics in such laboratory or laboratories: *And provided further*, That rules and regulations for the conduct of the work of the committee shall be formulated by the committee and approved by the President.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose a great deal of money—more money was wasted during the war with regard to aeroplanes and aeronautics than anything else. The Committee on Appropriations listened very patiently to the scientific men who came before it; men who are giving their time, without one cent of compensation, like Dr. Ames, of the Johns Hopkins University, and men of his character; men whose standing in the scientific world can not be questioned, and they impressed the committee with the fact that they are attempting at least to solve the big mili-

tary as well as civil question with regard to aeronautics. And scientific problem with regard to aeronautics, whether the plane is to be used for carrying mail or in the Army or the Navy, is to be studied there and there only. That scientific problem, it was intended, should be solved here. I think it was the purpose of the Naval Committee in so reporting this bill so that duplication of this kind of work could be avoided, and I commend the committee for its work in providing for this establishment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I recall the act of Congress distinctly, and we supposed this service would end. We understand that the same sort of service is being performed in the Navy Department now under an appropriation made directly in the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. Well, it certainly ought not to be. The service was provided here and provided at the commission's expense. The gentleman knows men like Dr. Ames are performing this service without any compensation at all. They have a field down here—Langley Field. There is a change in this respect, but if it is objectionable we will take that part out.

Mr. BUTLER. If an appropriation is to be made in this bill for that service, if I have anything to do with the naval appropriation bill, I certainly would see it was taken out.

Mr. GOOD. Here are men like Dr. Walcott, who receive no compensation at all; men like Dr. Stratton, of the Bureau of Standards, who receives no compensation for that work, and they say it is desirable work and work that ought to be done. Certainly we ought to know something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I thought I was discussing the point of order. I am discussing the proposition—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is discussing the merits of the paragraph, but the Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Iowa if there has been any amendment to the act to which he referred in the beginning of his remarks when he was discussing a point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know of any. I will say to the Chair that there may be some legislation in this paragraph, but if there is objection to changing the name of the field to the Langley Field—that is the place where the laboratory is located and there is a large field there that was established in memory of Prof. Langley—that may be legislation. I will say to the gentleman that I am just advised that the President has changed the name of the field, and this amendment is in conformity with the Executive order which changes the name of the field, and therefore it would not be subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the act referred to by the gentleman from Iowa, and he finds there is a paragraph in the act referred to by the gentleman which reads as follows:

That the sum of \$5,000 a year, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for five years is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available for experimental work and investigation undertaken by the committee, clerical expenses and supplies, necessary expenses of the members of the committee in going to and returning from and while attending meetings of the committee: *Provided*, That an annual report to Congress shall be submitted to the President, including an itemized account of expenses.

The Chair also notes that the paragraph in the bill carries language for the construction of additional buildings necessary in connection with the equipment, maintenance, and operation of the aeronautical laboratory. In the view of the Chair that language of the paragraph goes beyond the authorization of the law and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Will the Chair indulge me for a minute? I would like to amend the provision, because I think there is no provision in the bill that will save more money than this provision here; and I would like to know in what respect the Chair rules the paragraph is legislation. Because the paragraph the Chair has read did make provision for five years, it seems to me it can not be reasoned from that fact that at the conclusion of the five years the appropriation should then remain at \$5,000. Does it not fix a permanent agency? Here is a permanent agency, and for the first five years only was there a limitation on the expenditure, but no limitation after that. I will ask the Chair if the building down there of one large wind tunnel with quite extensive apparatus for making scientific investigations in regard to aeronautics is not permanent. Last year we appropriated \$200,000 for that purpose, which was to carry on that work, and the position we have taken was that that was only limited for the first five years. Now, if the Chair will indulge me, I would like to ask the Chair if that is the provision, the limitation of \$5,000, to which he refers?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that one of the provisions which does not conform to existing law is an authorization with reference to the construction of an additional building in connection with the maintenance and operation of the laboratory, and the Chair is not prepared to state that because an authorization limits an appropriation to a certain sum each year for a stated definite term that at the expiration of that period there is continued an authorization for appropriating money beyond that fixed in the limitation. It might well have been that the intention that this work was to continue for five years required a further authorization for its continuance beyond that period.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the first paragraph of the law itself provided that if there were a laboratory or laboratory place there that the money should be available for their operation. Here is the laboratory, and they have already constructed a wind tunnel. The law provides that in the event such laboratory or laboratories are there in whole or in part it should be placed under the direction of the committee and they were directed to conduct research and experiments in aeronautics in such laboratory or laboratories.

The CHAIRMAN. But that language would not seem to authorize the construction of laboratories above the amount appropriated. In the Chair's opinion it says that if the laboratories are placed, they are placed there under the direction of the committee. Certainly, the gentleman will not contend that that is broad enough language to authorize the construction of additional laboratories.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the Chair allow me to suggest?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The laboratories were to be constructed under the direction of the War Department and direction of the Navy Department. I would like to ask if we have not extensive laboratories—

Mr. GOOD. Where have they got a 6-foot wind tunnel in the United States?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They have one at Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. GOOD. No; they have not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They have wind caves.

I do not know the size of it. They have all the facilities for demonstration—

Mr. GOOD. They have facilities—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. At Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. GOOD. No; they have not all the facilities for demonstration at Dayton, Ohio, or anywhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The expenses of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for administrative purposes, the payment of claims arising from the cancellation of contracts, damage charges and miscellaneous adjustments, maintenance and operation of vessels, the completion of vessels now under construction, and for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920, shall be paid from the following sources: (a) The amount on hand July 1, 1921; (b) the amount received during the fiscal year 1922 from the operation of ships; and (c) not to exceed \$55,000,000 from deferred payments on ships sold prior to the approval of this act, from plant and material sold during the fiscal year 1922, and from ships sold during the fiscal year 1922: *Provided*, That after the approval of this act no contract shall be entered into or work undertaken for the construction of any additional vessels for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I make the point of order against the language on page 39, lines 23 and 24; on page 40, lines 1 and 2; and in line 22, page 39.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order on the language indicated.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I could not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the language.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The language contained on page 39, beginning with lines 23 and 24, and on page 40, lines 1 and 2, and line 3, to the figures "1922," and also in line 22, page 39, beginning after the word "sources."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order upon the language contained in the paragraph, beginning with line 22, "the amount on hand July 1, 1921," down to and including the figures "1922," page 40, line 3.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. A point of order was also made on the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make a point of order on the whole paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. It is subject to a point of order. I concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No contracts for ship construction to be entered into shall provide that the compensation of the contractor shall be the cost of construction plus a percentage thereof for profit, or plus a fixed fee for profit.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to inquire if it would not be highly proper to strike out the last four paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARNER. As I understand the paragraph just now, to which a point of order was made, was made on the ground that it changes existing law, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] conceded that the point of order was good. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa just how far he intended to go as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations under the present rules of the House in the matter of bringing in legislation on appropriation bills?

Mr. GOOD. The provision that is carried in the bill was similar to the provision now in existing law, placed in there with the intention to compel the Shipping Board to sell the ships as Congress had directed them to do. So far as the chairman is concerned—I can not speak for the committee—I am willing to go to almost any length to compel the Shipping Board, which is an agency of the Government, to do what Congress has many times directed it should do.

Mr. GARNER. I have no quarrel with the gentleman as to the merits of his proposition. What I am trying to get at, and what I think the House is entitled to know, is how far the Appropriations Committee, as now constituted under the rules, is going to undertake to invade the rules of this House?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As far as the Appropriations Committee always has while the gentleman from Texas has graced the floor of the House.

Mr. GARNER. I did not ask the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman was foxy. He was trying to put a gentleman in the hole. He can not put me in a hole.

Mr. GARNER. I can not put the gentleman from Illinois in a hole. I will admit that. I am trying to get information so that the House can understand just how far this committee, which I helped to create, is going toward continuing a policy of bringing in legislation on appropriation bills?

Mr. GOOD. I am sorry I can not speak for the committee.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say to the gentleman as one who helped to create that committee and believes in that policy, and believes it would redound to the economy in the conduct of the business of the House, if your committee is going to usurp the powers of other committees of the House I am in favor of going back to the old rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CALDWELL. I make a point of order against the paragraph. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the paragraph has been read, debate has been had upon it, and it is too late to make the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the funds of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1922 if suitable space is provided for the said corporation by the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this language in the bill seems to be in the nature of a limitation upon the use of funds.

Mr. CALDWELL. If the Chair please, if the Chair will hear me, under the Holman rule there must be a tendency to reduce the amount to be expended. Under this there is no tendency of that kind but an increase.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair will notice this is not a limitation upon the appropriation at all. A limitation upon the appropriation is in order. This is not a limitation upon the appropriation. There is no appropriation. It is a limitation

upon funds the Shipping Board has. I think it ought to be in the bill. I do not suppose it makes a cent's worth of difference one way or the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stands corrected. It refers to an appropriation other than that contained in the bill, and therefore it is merely legislation, and not a limitation on the appropriation bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the funds made available in this act for the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be expended for the preparation, printing, or publication of any bulletins, newspapers, magazines, or periodicals, or for services in connection with same, not including preparation and printing of reports or documents authorized by law.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 17 to 22, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOON: Page 40, line 17, strike out the paragraph beginning on line 17 and ending with line 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Museum, \$534,120.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I call attention to the total. While it is not important, the total here is incorrect. The total for the National Museum should be "\$415,120." Whoever made the computation included in the total the Astrophysical Observatory. That is on page 42, line 14, the total.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; my attention was called to that by a letter. It should be "\$415,120."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; the same as it is now.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move, on line 14, page 42, to strike out "\$534,120" and insert "\$415,120."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOON: On page 42, line 14, strike out "\$534,120" and insert "\$415,120."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses of the United States Tariff Commission, including purchase and exchange of labor-saving devices, the purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, books of reference, and periodicals as may be necessary, as authorized under Title VII of the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916, \$300,000.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DENISON. I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee, if he is able to do so, to tell us how much has been appropriated by Congress for the use of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. GOOD. One million four hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. DENISON. Since its creation?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; since the creation of this Tariff Commission.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. There was some appropriation for a former Tariff Commission, which was abolished, and since the creation of this present Tariff Commission the appropriations have amounted to \$1,400,000.

Mr. DENISON. Can the chairman give the House the benefit of his information as to what work the commission is accomplishing, and whether it is turning any output that may be of any benefit to the country?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. The commission, as I understand, during the past year has made a great many studies with regard to numerous questions upon which a tariff is based, preparatory to the work of helping the Committee on Ways and Means, so far as its investigations are concerned. The commission is not permitted under the law to make recommendations with regard to tariffs, or any matter of that kind. Its only function is to ascertain the facts and report the facts. They have made studies on a great many articles and a great many subjects, both here and abroad; and my recollection is that there were some-

thing like 40 or 50 pamphlets printed during the year, giving the results of those investigations. They asked for \$500,000, but under the law they are limited to \$300,000, which is the amount they have had every year since the creation of the commission save one.

Mr. DENISON. You do not mean that this commission came in and wanted \$200,000 more than was authorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. They have asked for \$200,000 more than was authorized by law for several years.

Mr. DENISON. What is the salary of the commissioners?

Mr. GOOD. Each member of the commission under the law receives a salary of \$7,500, and the secretary to the commission receives a salary of \$5,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will say that the commission has now almost finished a report on practically every paragraph contained in the present tariff law, and with reference to every article that might be subject to a tariff, for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means and for the use of Members of the House. I mention that particularly at this time, for the use of such Members of the House as desire at this time to study up the tariff question in advance and prepare themselves on the various sections of a tariff measure which will doubtless be taken up in the summer.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman thinks these investigations will be of real service to the committee in the preparation of a new tariff bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes. These investigations have been of great service to the committee. We could not do without them unless we had some force of our own in the committee to make the investigations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] a question, if I may be permitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 44, after line 20, insert the following caption: "War Department."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] how is this matter published or distributed that is printed by the Tariff Commission? How is it obtained? I understand it is at the service of the Committee on Ways and Means. Is it at the service of the average Member of Congress, and if so, how is it obtained?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. These reports are printed separately, something like the reports made with reference to tungsten, and with reference to laboratory glass, and other matters that came up at the last session of Congress in the House. They are printed in the form of pamphlets.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are they obtained?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman can obtain them of the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. FORDNEY] introduced a resolution authorizing the publication of several thousand copies of the various pamphlets from the Tariff Commission?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct, and the printing of these documents is now carried on as a part of the printing of the Ways and Means Committee, because I understand the Tariff Commission claim that they have exhausted the funds that they have for the purpose of printing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The reason of my inquiry was this: I thought obviously they would send these reports of their scientific findings to the several Members of the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not think that would be advisable as a blanket proposition, because a great many Members would not care to go through them, and it would be a great deal of work for Members to do so; but probably each Member has some particular item as to which he would like information. If so, he can obtain a report on the particular subject in which he is interested by applying to the clerk of the committee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under the law does not the commission make a report to the President on these matters, and is not that what the law requires?

Mr. GARNER. No; the law requires them, when directed, to make reports to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate may have them directly by requesting them, but does not the law require them as a matter of course to make their reports to the President? Sometimes their reports are transmitted to Congress. I occasionally get one through the document room.

Mr. GARNER. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia and other members of the committee that they will recall probably that this item was opposed by some of the Members of the House two years ago and even a year ago. That opposition seems to have faded away. It may arise again after the information given by the Tariff Commission to the next Congress, or it may not. If this commission fulfills its mission as the Members of the House who created it hope it will, I imagine they will give it all the money that it may need to continue its work. It largely depends upon its activities, and what the House may approve within the next six months.

Mr. GARRETT rose.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the reports of the Tariff Commission are satisfactory to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I am sure they will not be satisfactory to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. I move to strike out the last two words, in order to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, not the suggestion he has just made.

Section 703 provides that—

The commission shall put at the disposal of the President of the United States, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, whenever requested, all information at its command.

There does not seem to be anything in the act which requires it to report to anybody in particular.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I was under the impression that there was a provision in the act requiring them to report to the President. I think they make an annual report.

Mr. GARRETT. That may be. I have read the provisions of the statute.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I think the commission have made a practice of attempting to distribute their reports by sending letters to Congressmen asking them whether they desired a particular report. I think every Member of Congress will recall receiving such letters.

Mr. GARRETT. I know that has been done in some cases.

Mr. GOOD. If gentlemen want to clear this matter up, the law provides that the duties of the commission shall be—among other things—

And, in general, to investigate the operation of customs laws, including their relation to the Federal revenues, their effect upon the industries and labor of the country, and to submit reports of its investigations as hereafter provided.

Mr. GARNER. "Hereafter provided" means when they are called upon by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, or the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and installation of fire escapes, \$4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct a typographical error in the spelling of the word "escapes," in line 12, page 45.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordnance reservations, civilian schools: For the maintenance and operation of schools for children on ordnance reservations, \$28,500.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 46, after line 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Nitrate plant. For continuing construction of locks, dams, power house, and appurtenances authorized by the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, \$10,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] wanted to make it, and I only reserve it in the momentary absence of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Pending that I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of this amendment be postponed until we reach the end of line 8, page 166. That is the end of the bill, excepting the Panama Canal and a few other items. There are many Members who want to be present when this matter comes up.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed by one or two Members who are very anxious to vote on this proposition that they are likely to leave within the next day or two.

Mr. GARNER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if I understood the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]—

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Iowa made any request?

Mr. GOOD. I asked unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee be postponed until we reach the item "Panama Canal," at the end of line 8, on page 166.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee be postponed until after line 8, page 166, is reached. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. I object.

Mr. QUIN. I object.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Tennessee? I understand from the gentleman from Wyoming that the veto message of the President, as to the war-finance legislation, will be voted on immediately after the reading of the Journal tomorrow morning. If that is true, this is a very important matter, and I imagine that every Member of the House would like to be present, and I suggest that this be taken up immediately after the veto message is disposed of and that we vote upon it.

Mr. GOOD. If we can not postpone it to the end of the bill I think we had better go to the mat now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman make his point of order that it may be settled now.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I have agreed with certain Members of the House that there shall be pretty liberal debate on this amendment, and that it will take at least two hours, and it would come in immediately after the disposition of the veto message anyway.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have investigated this matter as thoroughly as I could in the time I have had at my disposal, and while my purpose was to urge the point of order to the amendment, I have satisfied myself that it is within the rule and is not subject to a point of order. Therefore, I shall not press the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa how long he expects to run this evening?

Mr. GOOD. I thought we ought to run until about 6 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. GOOD. We ought to begin the new year right.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I take it that there is going to be more or less extended discussion on this amendment. If we are not to conclude it this evening, it seems to me that it might be possible, if the entire committee is willing, to put it off until tomorrow after the disposition of the veto message and then consider and dispose of it.

Mr. GOOD. How much time does the gentleman feel will be required on that side of the House in favor of the amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have had a number speak to me, but I am not able to answer the question. It has been suggested that we have an hour and a half on a side.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours, one-half to those speaking in favor of the amendment and one-half to those opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by those in favor of the amendment and one-half by those opposed. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. To save time, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The gentleman from Tennessee has two minutes remaining of his five minutes on the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this proposition was discussed quite fully under general debate. The amendment which I have offered seeks to provide the funds necessary to continue the work now in progress on this dam at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River. I do not know that there is anything I can add to what I said at that time in support of this amendment.

Under section 124 of the national defense act the President of the United States was authorized to select a site and to construct a nitrate plant for the purpose of manufacturing explosives and fertilizer and other useful products, and also to select a site to begin the construction of dams, locks, power house, and other appurtenances necessary in his judgment for the operation of the plant.

Under that authority a commission was appointed, consisting of several members of the Cabinet and others who made an investigation of all sites available for the purposes indicated and reported to the President of the United States, and he selected a site at Muscle Shoals, near Florence, Ala., for a nitrate plant. The plant was commenced and has now been completed. More than \$70,000,000 was expended in the construction of plant No. 2, and nearly \$15,000,000 was expended in the construction of plant No. 1. A steam-power plant was also erected in connection with the plants.

Acting also under that authority the President in February, 1918, ordered that a dam be constructed, and he has allotted from the national-defense fund \$17,000,000 for commencing the construction of that dam. Twelve million dollars of that sum has been expended up to the present time, and those in charge of it state that by June 1 of next year the remaining \$5,000,000 will have been expended, and unless Congress makes a further appropriation the work on the dam must stop at that time.

They have there now an organization of more than 4,000 laborers employed. Very large sums have been spent in work necessary as a preliminary to the construction of such a large dam—in preparing the hillsides on either side of the river, laying necessary trackage, placing a number of cofferdams, constructing a temporary bridge, providing temporary shelter for the large force of men employed, and other preliminary work necessary in so great an undertaking. The dam is now 30 per cent completed. Col. Hugh L. Cooper, consulting engineer, in charge of the work, and Gen. Taylor state that if the work is stopped it will involve a loss of more than \$4,000,000. In addition to that, the Government will run the risk of losing all the money that has been expended in the way of cofferdams and other property belonging to the Government which is necessary to construct the dam if a flood should occur.

It is inconceivable to me that Congress intends to abandon this work. Everybody agrees that the Government should maintain the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals as a war emergency, because you gentlemen all know that when this war broke out we were absolutely dependent on Chilean nitrates for the manufacture of explosives. We were in a precarious situation, because if anything had happened to cut off the base of our supplies, or anything had happened to interfere with the shipment of these supplies on the high seas we would have been in a very unfortunate situation so far as the war was concerned.

The act which was passed in 1916, the national defense act, recognized that the interest and safety of our Government depended on maintaining that plant in time of peace, and it was therefore provided that this plant should be constructed not only with a view of providing explosives but with a view of manufacturing fertilizer and other useful products, if the Government should deem it necessary and proper to do so. If you do not make this appropriation and construct the dam, you can not run that plant in peace times. Everyone is agreed that steam power is too expensive, and that you must have the cheaper water power if you expect to manufacture nitrates for commercial purposes. The result will be, if you stop this work on June 1 or sooner, by failing to make this appropriation, the Government will have a large investment there of \$85,000,000 which you expect to be maintained as a war emergency, lying idle, depreciating both as to its machinery and its buildings and requiring a large and expensive guard force to protect it, and in addition you will be denying to the farmers of this coun-

try the cheaper fertilizer which they expect to receive as a result of the operation of that plant. I take it that every one of you gentlemen when you reached your office this morning found on your desk a copy of the letter which I hold in my hand, which is signed by Gray Silver, the Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Charles Lyman, secretary of the National Board of Farm Organization; and R. F. Bower, legislative agent, National Farmers' Union. What do they say? I will read it:

THE NATIONAL FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS DESIRE TO CALL YOUR ATTENTION TO THEIR CONCLUSIONS ON THE MUSCLE SHOALS PROJECT.

In deciding upon the item for \$10,000,000 to continue the work at the Muscle Shoals Dam, which has been debated before the House, you will determine the success or failure of the whole Muscle Shoals nitrate project as to its ability to furnish the farmer with cheaper fertilizer, and thus the consumer with cheaper food.

This is a clear-cut issue between the American producer and the American consumer jointly, on the one hand, and the great commercial interests on the other hand. In every instance where this project has been investigated by competent authorities it has proved to be unassailable, both from an engineering standpoint and from that of its economic return to the country as a whole.

As an illustration of its ability to stand criticism we wish to quote from the report returned to us from Prof. Stevenson, of Iowa:

"... Therefore farmers, farm organizations, and all those interested in securing cheaper foodstuffs should be interested in the passage of the Wadsworth-Kahn bill. The opposition of the fertilizer manufacturers and distributors to the bill is certainly not justified on the basis of the facts involved."

Similar reports have been returned to us from Illinois, New Jersey, and Virginia.

Our conclusions have been reached after careful investigation and study and were presented to each Member of the House with a request for their consideration in May of last year. They are contained in the farmers' presentation before the Senate Agricultural Committee on the Wadsworth bill, now the unfinished business before the Senate.

These conclusions are summed up as follows:

1. Nitrate plant No. 2, operating with cheap water power, can produce nitrogen compounds cheaper than any other source from which we now receive them.

2. This result can not be secured without the water power being made available.

3. With these cheaper nitrogen compounds increased amounts of food and clothing can be produced on the American farm without corresponding additional cost.

4. Government activity to increase crop production and safeguard fertility is a proper one and has official precedent in the irrigation projects.

The facts on which our conclusions are based have never been successfully contradicted, and the bitter opposition of the combined private interests to be affected demonstrate to us the correctness of our position, and this present definite attack upon the completion of the water power shows us how necessary the water power is to carry out our program.

In voting on this item for the continuation of the work at the Muscle Shoals Dam no Member of the Congress of the United States has ever had a better opportunity to register his position as between the interest of the consuming and producing public and the monopolistic interests that have in the past dominated the field of fertilizer manufacture.

While the issue may seem to you to be clouded, to us it is crystal clear and we ask you to trust to our judgment and give us support by your vote.

GRAY SILVER,
Washington Representative American
Farm Bureau Federation.
CHAS. A. LYMAN,
Secretary National Board of Farm Organizations.
R. F. BOWER,
Legislative Agent National Farmers' Union.

Gentlemen, this is a clear-cut issue as to whether or not you are going to respond to the demand of the entire farming interests of the United States or going to yield to the demand of the Fertilizer Trust and refuse to complete this dam and give to the farmers that opportunity to secure cheaper fertilizer for the production of their products, which they are asking. [Applause.]

I have received many letters on the subject. I wish to read just one, as a sample to show how the farmers regard this proposition. It comes from a prominent citizen of Nashville:

NASHVILLE, TENN., December 31, 1920.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNS: I am part owner in a 320-acre farm in Tennessee River Valley. It requires fertilizer yearly or production is limited.

We have all been looking forward to the power development of Muscle Shoals to produce nitrates at a price we can afford.

Fight for the money to complete the work and never give up. Been too much spent now to stop. It would be criminal.

Yours, truly,

L. G. WALDROP,

It was stated the other day in the general debate that the people of Tennessee are greatly interested in this matter. The people of Tennessee to a unit are interested in this matter, and why? Not only because the farming interests are interested in it, but because the Tennessee River touches the richest section in the whole United States in so far as mineral resources are concerned, and the construction of this dam will remove the chief obstacle to navigation on the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have coal, we have iron ore, we have zinc, we have copper, we have marble, and other minerals in Tennessee that can reach the market and enrich this country if the river is made navigable from above Knoxville to its mouth.

I do not as a general proposition favor the Government entering into competition in business with its citizens. I have had occasion to say so many times. But this is a different proposition. It means the salvaging of the immense investment of the United States. It means the maintenance of this plant as a war emergency and its operation during peace times, saving maintenance cost to the Government, and increasing production on the farm, benefiting not only the farmers but the consuming classes in the cities.

I want to say to the Republican Members of this House, you are in the majority and the responsibility will rest upon you, and you alone, if this proposition is defeated. The State of Tennessee in the last election, over my protest, it is true, for the first time since the Civil War gave recognition to the Republican Party. I want to ask you gentlemen whether or not in voting down this proposition and denying this great boon to the farmer and to the entire section, this is going to be your answer to the recognition which the State of Tennessee gave you in the last election? [Applause.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I may say that never in my experience have I before heard on this floor an appeal to vote for a proposition of this kind on the ground that a State will cast its electoral vote for President HARDING. That is the argument just offered. It only indicates how far removed from fairness in discussion has been this statement and others that have been made on the floor in favor of the Muscle Shoals proposition.

Mr. Chairman, on December 22, 1920, we voted here for an agricultural project—the emergency tariff bill to protect farmers. Many Members on both sides voted for it, but where was the gentleman from Tennessee who has just spoken at that time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee rose.

Mr. FREAR. He was paired with Mr. GOOD against it. A gentleman who has led in the fight for the Muscle Shoals \$10,000,000 amendment now proposed, Mr. GARRETT, voted against that bill to aid farmers, and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ALMON, who has plead for this amendment, he, too, voted against it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman say that I was paired against it? The gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman was paired with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, certainly; I was paired with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. FREAR. There was only one gentleman from Alabama who voted for that emergency agricultural tariff bill, Mr. STEAGALL, and that was a fair issue with the farmers' emergency tariff bill. If I am not correct, I ask to be corrected by gentlemen present. The question now comes on this Muscle Shoals proposition, and its supporters have been bringing all kinds of arguments of farmers' interests, sectionalism, and pressure of every kind to force this thing through Congress.

What is this proposal, Mr. Chairman? Originally the River and Harbor Committee were persuaded, in 1914, to bring in a bill for \$18,750,000 to put through a project down there in Alabama for water power, at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River. We took that up on the floor of the House and voted it out of the bill, although reported unanimously by the committee, and we beat it fairly. Then it came in a different form the next year in the military bill. It was brought in the House by a unanimous report of the Military Committee, this time for nitrates, with a \$20,000,000 joker proposal for Muscle Shoals water power. We exposed it again and beat it, in spite of the unanimous recommendation by the Military Affairs Committee. The proposal next went to the Agricultural Committee, this time for fertilizer. First, it was for water power, then for the benefit of nitrates; and, lastly, for fertilizer. Then the Secretary of War and President resurrected it for "war purposes," in time of war. I do not know how much money has been spent there since 1917 by the administration, but I understand it is all the way upward of \$120,000,000, while \$60,000,000 more are asked to be put in, which will run it eventually to two hundred millions or over for this Tennessee-Alabama water power.

It is now demanded of Congress that we must take this wasteful proposal and continue it because we have put so much Government money in it. Mr. Chairman, \$100,000,000 is a great deal of money to waste at Muscle Shoals, but we put over a billion dollars in air craft and got nothing in the shape of fighting craft. It was an awful chapter of public waste, amid many other wasteful war activities, but we wiped the slate and called it off.

We wasted hundreds of millions of dollars in Shipping Board projects. We might as well wipe that off the slate. Now, in the case of the Muscle Shoals project in Alabama the President of the United States, under the wide powers conferred on him during the war by law, has put over a hundred million in this Tennessee River project. Let us wipe that off the map in like manner, unless we know what policy is going to be pursued in respect to the manufacture of air nitrates by the Government. The gentleman from Tennessee says his friends in that State voted the Republican ticket, against his protest. This he confesses, much to his and, I believe, their credit. Was it not with the hope down in Tennessee that the party on this side of the aisle, my Republican brethren, would discontinue wasteful expenditures which have been so notorious during the past eight years? If that be true, and I believe the average Tennessee voter is against waste and extravagance, then here is a \$10,000,000 Muscle Shoals proposition you propose to saddle right on them in this bill for the taxpayers of the country to shoulder, without knowing what policy the country is going to pursue with this project. I admit the money is in there, a hundred million, largely wasted we are told. We could not stop it during the war; our hands were tied because of the war and power exercised by the administration, but now we do know the situation, and we act with due notice that this \$10,000,000 amendment is only throwing open the floodgates for the future. Determine the policy of this Government on the proposal to throw away sixty or eighty million dollars more before you spend one cent more money on this project. What are you getting? We heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] discuss this matter the other day at length when he showed it is impossible for the Government to carry this project through economically.

He was followed by Mr. JEFFERIS, also on the war investigating committee. They took over 3,000 pages of record evidence, disclosing the awful waste and in an effort to determine whether or not this was a good proposition for the Government to continue. Their judgment is that it is not, decidedly not. The gentleman who just spoke and for whom I have the highest respect, my friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], declared, as I understood, that there was no one to question but what this would be a proper project for the Government to continue. Yet the other day man after man arose in his place and dissipated that idea, protesting against the project, because they believed this is both wasteful and useless. Although I believe it is money thrown away, I will not say junk the proposition until we decide what we are to do with it. I know that lobbyists year after year sat up in the gallery day after day when the bill came up in some form with the Muscle Shoals project in, and they got it only by the action of the administration as a proposed war measure. I do not know what influence was brought to bear upon the President. It was in time of war and it might have been thought a proper thing to do in war to try and make some effort, however wasteful, to manufacture air nitrates. It was shown the other day that in the by-products of coal a more economical manufacture of nitrates could be had at small expense.

That was discussed by my friend from Illinois, Mr. GRAHAM, who said there is no question but what that was the wise thing to do if we were going to undertake a speedy effort to get nitrates. The question of sectionalism has been raised by my friend from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT. He says his friends so regard opposition to this amendment. We have given a hundred million dollars for the lower Mississippi River for an insignificant water traffic. That assuredly was not sectionalism. We have given over \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 for the Tennessee River in Government appropriations, and they have practically no waterway traffic to-day. An analysis of the reports so shows. Millions upon millions have been given to the Warrior River down in Alabama, with little result, and yet there is talk now of sectionalism because of opposition to this \$200,000,000 wasteful war project. Why, no more generous treatment could have been had. There is no sectionalism, except that the section named is always demanding more money. Now, you say that having this money invested, let us finish it. That is no investment. It is largely money thrown away. The people of the country will hold the party on this side of the aisle responsible for their action on this \$10,000,000 amendment, and let me urge as strongly as I

can that we stop this extravagance before we get in deeper. There is no question of sectionalism, nor of investment, nor of any benefit to farmers. There is a matter of heavy taxes to be paid, and judgment must be exercised before we spend more money on Muscle Shoals after having sunk already \$100,000,000 in this Tennessee River proposition.

How much are you going to put in? Two hundred million dollars? What are you going to get then? Not one man in Congress knows. You have not any experience to base it upon. It means a continual waste of the taxpayers' money.

My friends, that is all I have to say. I do not care to discuss it further. We should have a policy and have it determined, not from the viewpoint of these people who want something down on the Tennessee River, but we should begin fundamentally to do things right in a business way, to do things because they are going to be profitable to the Government, and not sit here day after day fighting over an automobile or a clerkship, or some little insignificant expenditure, and then swallowing a wasteful, useless proposal continued by an annual expense of \$10,000,000 and have nothing at the end except experience.

Our professions of public economy will be judged by our acts and not by lip service.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a request? I think it would be to the best interests of everybody if we knew about when the vote on this amendment would come to-morrow. Men are asking me, those in favor and those opposed, how much debate will be had to-morrow. I can not tell them. I want, so far as I am concerned, to give ample opportunity to discuss it. It is a big item. I am going to ask that one hour and a half be allowed to-morrow on this amendment and all amendments thereto, one-half of the time to be divided among those in favor of the amendment and one-half by those opposed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why will not the gentleman agree to stay here until 10 or 11 o'clock to-night and finish this matter and expedite the business?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that nobody would want to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this item be limited to one hour and a half, one-half of the time to be consumed—

Mr. GOOD. The request was for one hour and a half to-morrow. We will run some time yet this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate to-morrow be limited to one hour and a half on this amendment and all amendments thereto. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENSON. With the provision that time is to be equally divided between those in favor and those opposed?

The CHAIRMAN. The time to be equally divided between those in favor of the proposition and those opposed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the last gentleman who spoke said this was a war measure and that it had been injected into legislation purely as a war proposition. I want to call the attention of the House, particularly of the new Members of the House, to the fact that this proposition originated in the Sixty-fourth Congress before the United States went into the war, and that it has been continually and consistently fought by the little Army and little Navy men on that side even during the war period, and, notwithstanding this opposition, this proposition has had sufficient merit that its proponents have been able to defend it on all occasions. Now, I remember very distinguished Members of this House, and particularly those on that side of the aisle, who during the year 1917 derided the Democrats in this House because they had not prepared this country in the time of peace for its defense.

I notice with a feeling of regret that the very men who had those criticisms in their mouths every day of that Congress are here to-day criticizing the Democrats of this House because we have too much preparedness now, and the opposition on that side of the House comes from those people who are opposed to the United States being in a condition to defend itself against all comers at all times.

How are you going to fight a war unless you have ammunition to fight it with? And how are you going to have ammunition unless you have the nitrate with which to make it? Somebody says you can make it from coal. And yet, during the war, when our great coal plants were being used and developed for this purpose, only a very small percentage of the nitrate that went into our ammunition came from the coal production.

Who is it in this House that is always criticizing this proposition, saying that there is a lobby here promoted and paid by

a certain power company that is in favor of it? Have you heard anybody in this House retaliate by referring those gentlemen to the fact that there is a very large interest in America that is opposed to this proposition because their assets and their affairs are tied up in the importation of Chilean nitrates, and that with the right kind of a factory here in the United States those people would not have the monopoly that they now enjoy? Who has been in favor of this proposition that has ever tried to raise any issue of that kind? Not one. No improper motive has been suggested by this side of the House to any person who has opposed this proposition. The merit of the Muscle Shoals proposition is good enough to stand on its own feet. It is good enough to stand in the light of day; it is good enough—

Mr. FREAK. In fairness, I want to say that was in a past day, when Mr. Washburn and others always sat up here in the gallery; not during the consideration of the present bill. I want that understood.

Mr. CALDWELL. I want the gentleman to understand that I cast no reflection on him or his motives, because I know they are of the highest. I will say, gentlemen, that there are men in this House who will live to rue the day that they opposed the preparation of this country against its possible enemies.

Has any one of you recently taken stock of the military affairs of the world or its economic necessities to determine whether or not America has anything to take consideration of? Do you know who has the largest army, and who has the smallest, according to its population? Do you know who has the largest commerce and the biggest carrying trade? Have you examined into the history of the world and found out what was the cause of all the wars we have had in the past, and determined whether or not America was fast walking into that situation where all the world must necessarily either bow to her commercial power or fight her? Do you know that even to-day there are treaties extant between the great naval powers of the world which almost in terms—if not in words themselves—provide that they shall join their forces, even against the United States? And I say to you that if the two greatest navies in the world next to the great Navy of America are combined against us, it will no longer be possible for you to carry in merchant shipping the necessary nitrates from the Chilean ports to the United States to defend ourselves.

The nitrate importers are against this measure, the producers of nitrate from coal are against this measure, the Anglomaniacs are against this measure, and the pacifists and false economy howlers of this House are their easy dupes.

When America went to war in 1917, I contemplated with horror our utter helplessness once we lost control of the sea, either by reason of the U-boat or Zeppelin. I am leaving public life and returning to the private practice of my profession. There is no politics in this vote on my part. I vote for this proposition because I love my country and I do not want her ever to be in the helpless condition she was in in 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, the select committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] is chairman, raised to investigate war expenditures, has turned its attention to the activities of the War Department in relation to the production of nitrogen, an essential element in the manufacture of explosives.

The hearings of the committee cover fifteen hundred printed pages and deal with every phase of the subject. The volume embracing these hearings constitutes a very distinct and most valuable contribution to the literature, affording information as to the nitrate industry throughout the world.

The investigation has served to expose to public view, by laying bare the inner facts, the methods adopted in procuring the authorization of the appropriation and the selection of a site for a plant to take nitrogen from the air.

The Muscle Shoals project, it is now apparent, was originally a "pork-barrel" proposition. Exigency of war was the excuse for entering upon the vast scheme of river improvement and expenditure of public money. The committee has found that the Government has expended for construction upon its nitrate program \$116,194,974.37 and produced no nitrate prior to the armistice and contributed nothing thereby toward the winning of the war.

One hundred millions of the sum I have mentioned were spent on the Tennessee River at or near Muscle Shoals. In order to

proceed with the construction of what is known as the Wilson Dam, designed to afford water power for the plant, gentlemen are now asking for an appropriation of \$10,000,000. It is conceded that if this appropriation were made that many more millions would be required to complete the project.

The record will disclose that there are in Chile vast quantities of sodium nitrate, easily transportable to this country either to the Pacific coast or by way of the canal to the Atlantic seaboard, and, furthermore, that our coal by-products plants are producing a very great quantity of ammonium sulphate, convertible into nitrate, but in the main this was a scheme to secure to promoters hydroelectric power at Government expense. Had this not been so, the advice of experts and the findings of boards that Muscle Shoals was not the place for such a plant would not have been ignored, and the opinion of the President, acting at the behest of politicians, substituted. The construction of the plant reveals the same old methods that obtained at Nitro, W. Va., and elsewhere. Waste and incompetence, if not graft and crime, characterized these vast expenditures of the people's money. One hundred and sixteen millions, the amount expended, as graphically shown by the chairman, would have been more than sufficient to have constructed a great paved public highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. While the people were working and stinting, straining and saving, in order to invest in Liberty bonds, we find that the Government agents, like drunken sailors, were spending that money with a lavish hand, as, for example, in building sumptuous clubhouses for the officers, one of these clubhouses, at plant No. 2, costing \$360,000. The scheme was not so much to extract from the air nitrogen as it was to put life into the river project, which had been turned down by almost every Congress for the past 20 years. This vast expenditure of moneys was based upon a comparatively obscure and innocent-looking phrase to be found in the fortifications act—page 2580, committee hearings:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of munitions for mountain, field, and siege cannon, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith, the machinery necessary for its manufacture, and necessary facilities.

The Secretary of War, in his testimony before the committee, justified his action by insisting that the statute I have quoted, by a little "twisting," was a sufficient warrant for the course pursued. His precise language I quote, as follows:

So that if you twist that section around and get it to read less legislatively but more intelligently, I think it authorizes the department to spend this money to manufacture munitions for field cannon and to make necessary experiments to do that and to buy the necessary machinery and the necessary facilities.

My observation, here in Washington, is that it is frequently the case that those seeking to secure favorable action of Congress upon a given matter find it to their advantage to somewhat camouflage their object by insisting that their scheme comprehends the accomplishment of some worthy end. A celebrated French woman once had occasion to say, "Oh, Liberty, what crimes have been committed in thy name." In these latter days legislative crimes have been committed in the name of "winning the war," and of "assisting the soldier," and of "helping out the farmer." "Helping out" is about the right expression, for my experience teaches me that the farmer, suffering from ill-advised spokesmen in and out of Congress, is "helped out" more often than he is helped in. A few days ago there was an agitation here for the restoration to action of the Federal War Trade Board upon the ground that this "would help the farmer," when, as a matter of fact, if it shall help anybody, it will help the copper, iron, lumber, or other producer just as much, if not more, than it will the farmer. But I have digressed.

The old promotion scheme, known as the Muscle Shoals project, having by legislative action, administrative interpretation, and political pull, paraded through the war under the guise of patriotism, is now masquerading under the pretext of rendering service to the farmer. The backers of Muscle Shoals say that if Congress will give them money enough they will take nitrogen from the air and that such nitrogen will be useful in the manufacture of fertilizer for the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, the great source of supply of ammonium sulphate for the people of the United States and of the world is coal. Ammonium sulphate, convertible into nitrate, is a by-product of coal. Ammonium sulphate is the essential element in fertilizer and in explosives. The corn and cotton plant when fed upon it are given growth and strength. When compounded with other ingredients, its chemical action becomes a terrible force for the propulsion of a projectile, from a great gun, through miles of space. Coal, therefore, is a sufficient source for nitrates necessary for use in times of peace as in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, I have now arrived at the point in my argument where I propose to consider, somewhat in detail, the subject of "By-products of coal." The great majority of our people but little, or only vaguely, appreciate the composition of a lump of coal, its analysis, derivatives, and their uses.

Mr. Wightman D. Roberts, editor of the West Virginia Mining News, in an article of recent date published in that journal, says:

In fact, by-product coke ovens were not taken seriously by the steel industry until 1906, when the United States Steel Corporation appointed a committee of well-known engineers and works managers to investigate the manufacture of by-products coke for blast furnace use.

The committee, after months of the most thorough investigation of the principal by-product coke plants in the United States and Europe, finally selected from the European field the Koppers Cross regenerative oven. On the basis of this selection a plant of 280 Koppers ovens was built at Joliet, Ill., and put into operation in 1908.

The effect of this committee's work has been far-reaching. Its approval brought about the large development of the by-product coke industry in the United States and the consequent conservation of one of our most valuable natural resources. The furnace results procured with the coke from these ovens caused blast-furnace managers quite generally to reverse their former position on by-product coke, and it is now universally conceded that better furnace operation with higher iron production and lower coke consumption can be secured by the use of by-product coke than with beehive coke.

The by-product recovery plant serves to clean the gas and to recover from it as by-products tar, ammonia, and benzols. The ammonia may be recovered either in the form of ammonia liquor or as ammonium sulphate.

The ammonium sulphate formed in the saturator is pumped into drain tables and then dried by means of centrifugal driers. After being dried, the salt is carried to a storage pile, from which it is delivered for shipment. Ammonium sulphate has many industrial uses, but its most important use is as a nitrogen carrying fertilizer.

To enumerate the various uses of coal tar would require a volume in itself.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore clear that it has not been so many years since the coke made in this country was manufactured in what is known as the beehive oven. The coal was put into the oven and burned, and all of the volatile matter and essential oils were destroyed or went up into the air. Within the past 15 years a great change has been wrought in respect to the manufacture of coke. There have been introduced and installed in various parts of the United States plants dealing with the by-products of coal. These great plants have grown and developed until they are producing articles that are numbered not only by the hundreds but by the thousands. That great industry has expanded until during the year 1919 over half of the coke produced in the United States was made in by-product ovens.

One of the products of these ovens is ammonium sulphate, and in the year 1919—we do not have the statistics of 1920—over 500,000 tons of ammonium sulphate was produced in by-product ovens. It is a great and growing industry, and it is believed by competent authority that within the next 10 years we shall see the disappearance of all of the old beehive ovens and the coke manufactured in by-product plants located around the great cities, where the gas may be extracted and distributed through pipes to the people; where the tar may be made that goes to pave our highways; where the medicines may be made, the ingredients of our drugs, and so forth; where the paints and colors may be made for the use of the people.

This great industry, now in its infancy, needs to be fostered and developed in a broad way. As I understand it, the plant in Alabama is only estimated to produce about 80,000 tons of sulphate, and it can not produce that, at least the water power can not, because there must be installed an auxiliary steam plant to augment the hydraulic power in order even to get the comparatively insignificant amount of 100,000 tons, as estimated by some gentlemen, and 80,000 tons as estimated by others, of ammonium sulphate.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I yield to the gentleman, with pleasure.

Mr. ALMON. The statement there in the hearing about 80,000 tons of ammonia sulphate to be produced there is for a certain number of units. The capacity is 110,000 tons of nitrate and about twice that amount of sulphate of ammonia.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The facts brought out before my committee show that the plant in full operation, according to the Glasgow plan, would produce about 83,000 tons; that is all.

Mr. ALMON. But other units of the same plant would be used for the manufacture of other things.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The evidence shows that the plant would produce that much ammonium nitrate.

Mr. ALMON. If other parts of plants were used for the manufacture of ammonia sulphate, the amount produced would be 200,000 tons.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The specifications of the plant call for only 83,000 tons of ammonia sulphate.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. We can get all the chemicals we need for the manufacture of powder from the by-products plant. We can get all the chemicals we need for the manufacture of fertilizer from the by-products plant. Therefore I see no necessity of creating a great capitalized concern that will never pay operating expenses, much less interest on the investment, and which will serve to retard the progress of by-product development and constitute a great burden upon the taxpayer.

From coal tar come wonderful cosmetics which add to the softness, smoothness, color, and consequent beauty of the skin of our lady's face and hands, and the most delightful perfumery to lend its exquisite fragrance to her dainty and delicious personality. The delicate aroma of her soap is from the oil of mirbane—nitrobenzene. One of her perfumes, catalogued as "coumarine," "has the scent of new-mown hay."

It will thus be seen that the derivatives of coal, in so perfecting the beauty, purity, and charm of woman, make for domestic happiness in this, that it gives unto the femme coquet of advancing years the power of holding in leash the ravages of old Father Time and by rendering herself beautiful and attractive to her husband and to all others as well.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a chart published by the Solvay Collieries Co., of which Mr. A. B. Rawn is the general manager, of Huntington, W. Va., in the form of a tree springing out of a bed of coal. The figure, bowl, limbs, and twigs, by proper designations, admirably represent the by-products of the coal. I am under obligations for the use of this chart in the study of the proposition with which I am attempting to deal.

DYES.

Of the coal-tar products used for painting and coloring we may mention blue, green, black, indigo, malichite-green, Bismark-brown (used for dyeing leather), yellow, orange, red, violet, mauve (used in English postage stamps), and others, there being over 500 shades. These dyes are useful alike to the great painter, who delineates the landscape or the human form upon canvas, and to the little boy and girl who color their Easter eggs. They serve the dyers of cotton, woolen, linen, and silk fabrics, no less than the workman who paints the exterior or decorates the interior of the habitations of man. We should build up the dyeing industry of the United States.

MEDICINES AND DRUGS.

Of medicines and drugs we find aspirin, salol, salicylic acid, phenol, oil of wintergreen, antipyrin, acetanilid, phenacetin, and many others. We, therefore, see that coal comes to persons sick and suffering, and soothes their pain, remedies their ills, and helps to restore them to health and happiness.

PITCH.

Pitch used for paving our streets and public highways, for roofing, insulation, concreting, and general water-proofing purposes. Coal, in producing pitch, proves itself to be the friend of both the home builder and the road builder, doing service alike to those who live in the city and those who dwell in the country, furnishing as a facility for transportation good roads for the farmer as also for the man living in the village or the city.

COKE AND GAS.

Metallurgical coke for furnace, foundry, and smelting purposes. The production and manufacture of iron and steel, of copper, zinc, and lead, and the smelting of gold and silver ores, depends upon coke, the chief by-product of coal. Domestic coke, coke breeze, briquets, and so forth, for fuel purposes, and gas for domestic and general uses.

GRAPHITE.

Graphite for lead pencils and to lubricate the journals of railroad cars and the bearings of machinery.

LAMPBLACK.

Lampblack for writing and printer's ink, the blacking and polish for shoes, harness, and many other purposes.

ANTISEPTICS.

Also antiseptics, including carbolic acid, cresol, phenol, and so forth.

CLEANSING.

For cleansing purposes there are to be found naphthalene and benzol.

FLAVORS.

For flavoring purposes, saccharine, also useful as a drug, being substituted for sugar in the case of patients afflicted with certain ailments.

PRESERVATIVES.

As preservatives, creosote for railroad ties and fence posts, and benzoic acid for foodstuffs.

Also chemicals for use in hair tonics and in the art of photography.

Anhydrous ammonia for ice making and refrigeration generally. How could we get along without ice? If we had no ice, of what use would be our refrigerators? What would we do for ice cream?

To these may be added varnish, sulphur, paint thinners, denaturants, solvents, shingle stains, disinfectants (formaldehyde); also insecticides for use of orchardists (in spraying fruit trees); cattle and sheep growers in dipping their animals; truckers (in destroying predatory pests); for the householder, as a poison for rats, bedbugs, and other vermin.

EXPLOSIVES.

The coal-tar products of greatest importance as raw materials in the explosive industry are benzene, toluene, naphthalene, and phenol (carbolic acid). From these come picric acid (also employed in surgical dressings for burns and wounds) and trinitrotoluene (T. N. T.), an explosive of powerful and deadly energy.

FOR MOTOR ENGINES.

Benzol is finding an increased use as motor fuel in the place of gasoline, for an authority says it is capable of producing 20 per cent more mileage per gallon than gasoline.

There is being extracted from natural gas about 1 gallon of gasoline for every 1,000 cubic feet of gas. Natural gas is rapidly approaching exhaustion and nature does not recalculate it. Wherefore the world must look to benzol or other products of coal for its source of motive power for motor-driven land, sea, and air vehicles.

To catalogue all of the derivatives of coal tar thus far discovered—and chemists tell us that the subject is still in its infancy and will be developed to almost undreamed-of proportions—would require a volume.

The specific uses and purposes of the coal-tar derivatives now being produced are almost beyond imagination. Coal, therefore, is the great friend of man, contributing to him in matters of light, heat, power, color, medicine, locomotion, manufactures, lubricants, germicides, cleansing agents, preservatives, photography, cosmetics, perfumery, denaturants, solvents, refrigeration, self-defense, food, raiment, and shelter. For what one other product of the earth do we owe the Creator so great a debt of gratitude as we do for His bountiful gift of coal? Coal is perhaps America's greatest material asset. It is the factor that will render her preeminent in the affairs of the world, for she holds 52 per cent of the coal supply of the world.

Mr. O. P. Austin, statistician of the National City Bank of New York, says:

On this question of world's supply of coal it is well enough to say that expert estimates of the world's stock of existing coal, the "reserve," so called, while probably familiar to the readers of the West Virginia Mining News, are worth repetition in this general survey of future possibilities. The World Geological Congress held in Canada just prior to the war put the United States coal "reserve," or stock remaining underground, at 3,839,000,000,000 tons, or 52 per cent of the world's total; Canada, 1,234,000,000,000 tons, or 17 per cent of the total; China 996,000,000,000 tons, or 14 per cent of the total; and Great Britain, which formerly led the world as a coal exporter, only 190,000,000,000 tons, or less than 3 per cent of the world's total.

These statistics would leave 14 per cent to the nations other than those mentioned. In my State alone—West Virginia—according to Dr. I. C. White, the celebrated geologist, there exists from sixty to seventy-five billions of tons of merchantable, recoverable coal, a volume equal to one-third of the supply of Great Britain. But according to Mr. C. E. Krebs, geologist and mining engineer, of Charleston, W. Va., the State has a further supply of one hundred billions of tons in thin veins, not estimated by Dr. White, making the ultimate recoverable coal supply almost equal to that of Great Britain. In this particular I direct your attention to the fact that in Belgium coal 15 inches thick is shafted for to a depth of 1,200 feet.

It is proper at this juncture to note, Mr. Chairman, that all coal is not adapted to by-product treatment. The principal supply of by-product coal in this country is found in four States, which, in order of the volume of their supply, are Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia. These States have an almost inexhaustible supply of coal fit for by-products use. By-product coals are those that have from 25 to 34 per cent of volatile matter and are low in sulphur and ash.

In West Virginia the seams adapted to by-products use are the War Eagle, Little Eagle, Eagle, Pond Creek, Powelton, Pocahontas, Alma, Cedar Grove, Chilton, and the No. 2 Gas.

Dr. Chester G. Gilbert, curator of mineral technology, National Museum (in Bulletin 102, pt. 1), in contrasting the ad-

vantages of the by-products oven over the beehive, tells us, at page 12:

More definitely expressed, the contrast means a saving of around 200 pounds of coke, about 5,000 cubic feet of gas, some 15 gallons of tar, and the ammonia in 20 pounds of ammonium sulphate along with 2 gallons of benzol for every ton of coal coked.

And further, in relation to the industry, he says, at page 13:

* * * a storehouse affording essentials in agriculture, pharmacy, photography, textiles, disinfection, explosives, refrigeration, painting, paving, waterproofing, wood preservation, and an ever-widening circle of more specific requirements touching every aspect of human life. The magnitude of the contrast is precisely the measure of coal product potentiality.

Coal product manufacture, with its elaboration of complex interrelationships calling for coordination of development along scores of directions at once highly specialized and widely diversified, represents the most advanced order of industrial evolution thus far attained.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me five statistical tables which, by the permission of the committee, I will insert in the RECORD. Table I, covering the years 1910 to 1919, inclusive, indicates the coal used for coke manufacture in the United States. This table is of the highest value in showing the departure from the beehive to the by-product oven. For example, in 1910 there were used for coking 63,088,327 tons of coal, of which 53,559,285 tons—more than 80 per cent—were used in beehive, and 9,529,042—less than 20 per cent—in the by-products ovens, whereas, according to the estimates for 1919, there were used for coking 66,747,216 tons of coal, of which 31,051,716 tons—about 45 per cent—were used in the beehive and 35,695,500—or about 55 per cent—in the by-products process. Wherefore, we may be reasonably safe in predicting that by the end of the next decade the beehive oven will have become a thing of the past.

Table II illustrates the yield of coke and other fundamental by-products of coal.

Table III shows the tonnage of ammonium sulphate used in fertilizers in this country during certain years.

Table IV shows the production in the United States of ammonium sulphate for years 1901 to 1919, inclusive.

Table V shows the imports of Chilean nitrates for the years 1901 to 1908, both inclusive.

TABLE I.—Coal used for coke manufacture in the United States.

Year.	Coal used for beehive coke.	Coal used for by-product coke.	Total.
1910.....	53,559,285	9,529,042	63,088,327
1911.....	42,831,664	10,446,564	53,278,248
1912.....	50,810,319	14,767,543	65,577,862
1913.....	52,143,821	17,095,369	69,239,190
1914.....	36,123,729	15,500,021	51,623,750
1915.....	42,278,515	19,554,382	61,832,898
1916.....	55,084,958	26,524,502	81,609,460
1917.....	52,246,612	31,505,759	83,752,371
1918.....	48,166,719	36,867,721	85,034,440
1919.....	31,051,716	35,695,500	66,747,216

¹ Estimated.

TABLE II.—Yields of coke and by-products in Keppers ovens.

From a typical coal mixture of:			
Pittsburgh high volatile coal.....	per cent.....		85
Pocahontas low volatile coal.....	do.....		15
Metallurgical coke.....	per cent of coal.....		69
Domestic coke.....	do.....		2
Breeze.....	do.....		4
Surplus gas.....	cubic feet per net ton.....		6,600
Gas for heating ovens.....	do.....		4,400
Tar.....	gallons per net ton.....		25
Ammonium sulphate.....	pounds per net ton.....		2
Pure benzol.....	gallons per net ton.....		2.08
Pure toluol.....	do.....		0.56
Pure xylol.....	do.....		0.32
Crude solvent.....	do.....		0.40

TABLE III.—Ammonium sulphate used in fertilizers in United States.

	Tons.
1913.....	215,000
1918.....	103,000
1919.....	190,000
1930 (estimated).....	780,000

TABLE IV.—Productive of ammonium sulphate in United States.

	Tons.
1901.....	29,279
1902.....	36,124
1903.....	41,873
1904.....	54,664
1905.....	65,296
1906.....	75,300
1907.....	99,309
1908.....	83,400
1909.....	106,500
1910.....	116,000
1911.....	127,000
1912.....	165,000
1913.....	195,000
1914.....	183,000

	Tons.
1915.....	250,049
1916.....	288,265
1917.....	370,044
1918.....	450,000
1919.....	500,000

TABLE V.—Imports of Chilean nitrates into the United States.

	Tons.
1900.....	180,000
1901.....	192,000
1902.....	221,000
1903.....	264,000
1904.....	274,000
1905.....	305,000
1906.....	361,900
1907.....	351,600
1908.....	308,800
1909.....	399,000
1910.....	503,600
1911.....	537,000
1912.....	469,100
1913.....	560,010
1914.....	521,030
1915.....	727,867
1916.....	1,232,308
1917.....	1,376,693
1918.....	1,800,000

In view of the fact that the gentlemen demanding the vast appropriation for Muscle Shoals with lusty voices are proclaiming that this is all in the interest of the farmer, the tables have an important bearing; for example, they indicate that there were used in 1919 for fertilizer only 190,000 tons of sulphate, whereas the by-products plants produced during the same year 500,000 tons of sulphate, more than double the quantity needed for fertilizer. In addition thereto the Government had on hand, and I presume still holds, over 500,000 tons of Chilean nitrates for such use as the interests of the people may require.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that the interest of the farmer as regards a proper source for an adequate supply of fertilizer, the interest of the Government in the production of explosives, and the interests of the whole American people in very many ways, especially as regards the conservation of our natural resources, will, each and all, be promoted by permitting the coal by-products process to continue its course and to reach its normal development unhindered by governmental restraints and barriers. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to this amendment comes in a peculiar way. After all the talk the other day about being friends of the farmer, gentlemen on the other side came forward with a bill to rob the farmer under the pretense that they were going to protect him, and some gentlemen on the Democratic side fell into that trap. Now, at the first opportunity that you gentlemen have to demonstrate that you propose to be of some assistance to the farmers of this country you turn a deaf ear and kill the proposition in the committee.

I happen to know something about this legislation because it came through the Military Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, and after having been defeated three times before that committee, and after being defeated on the floor of the House, it went over to the Senate and was there put into the bill. In the meantime the legislative representative of the farmers had caused word to be sent here from some of the agricultural districts of the United States, and fires had been built under certain gentlemen sufficiently so that they were caused to vote for the proposition, and a majority of them did vote for it and enacted it into law. After that, acting on the best expert advice in the United States, this plant was located down at Muscle Shoals, Ala., for two purposes; to make powder in the event of war; and, secondarily, for commercial fertilizers for the farmers of this country. Although we were at war and needed nitrates for powder certain gentlemen on this floor who are still Members of the House fought the proposition at every stage, and some are fighting it to-day. Now, what is the real reason for that? The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ] told you the reason. It happens that this plant will come in competition with some men who have money invested in coke plants and chemical works and fertilizer factories. The reason they are fighting it is because they know it will be a competitor in producing fertilizer for commercial purposes, to place on the lands of this country to help produce food and raiment for the people.

Every man who has any judgment at all knows that Muscle Shoals, Ala., far from the danger of invasion from the sea,

away yonder in the mountains, is a safe place to have this splendid plant to produce nitrates to protect this country in time of war. But, laying that aside and coming now to peace times, about \$100,000,000 have been expended, great plants have been erected, and with the dam across the river unfinished, a simple appropriation of about \$10,000,000 is asked in this bill to continue that work, and it is estimated that the total cost to complete it will be perhaps \$35,000,000 more. Then this splendid plant, with \$100,000,000 already expended upon it, will stand as an asset of this country to make fertilizer in competition with the private companies that the gentleman from West Virginia seems so anxious about. Why, some gentlemen say that they can not produce these things at Muscle Shoals at an economical price. Yet the men who seem to represent the gentlemen engaged in the manufacture of this fertilizer for commercial purposes are on this floor fighting it. If the friends of the farmer throughout the United States desire that this plant shall be completed and the fertilizer placed on the market, why should those object to it who say that it can not be manufactured at a price that the farmers can pay? After all this waste which you have gone through, after all the extravagance you have stood for, after all the extravagance you are still standing for, now you talk about economy to keep the farmers from having some fertilizer. This method drags the fertilizer down out of the atmosphere and places it on the fields of this country to produce food for the people to eat and cotton for them to wear and sugar to sweeten their coffee. Yet gentlemen oppose it on the pretext that it is not economy to complete it.

Would it be economy to allow \$100,000,000 to go to waste; would it be economy to let that dam, one-third completed, go to ruin? Can any man who has any business intelligence conclude by any process of ratiocination that it would be better to allow this enormous and valuable investment to go to destruction? For what? No excuse has been given up to this hour why that plant could not be a success and why it would be an economy to throw away \$100,000,000 that is already invested there when there is staring us in the face the fact that throughout the United States the agricultural classes are crying for cheaper fertilizer.

Some gentleman said that we could get all the fertilizer we needed from the Chilean plains. Do they know that there never was a supply so great that it could not be exhausted? Do they know that while that great field has been opened the farmer has been paying very high prices for fertilizer? Do they know that the nitrates that the Government brought in during the war is all that saved the farmers of the country? Yet with all that experience in the past before them, gentlemen are here against the completion of this splendid plant that they know will make fertilizer for all the United States.

Now, this plant is not in my State, and I have no selfish motive in advocating it. I know that the plant will afford fertilizer that will go out all over every State in the Union. I know that the farmers of the United States have been exploited by the fertilizer producers of the United States, and that exploitation will be continued unless there is some kind of competition. I know that what the Government proposes here will be a most beneficial competition to the farmers. And yet some gentlemen object to it because they do not want the Government to help do anything. Why, you have turned the Government Treasury over to a lot of different things in the United States. You turned it over to the railroads. You gentlemen passed a railroad bill where you guaranteed the dividends for a certain length of time to stockholders of these roads. You made Government guarantees to banks; and yet when we come with this twofold purpose to help the farmers, ask that the improvement be continued, gentlemen object. Gentlemen, I think this amendment ought to be adopted and the nitrate plant completed and fertilizer furnished at cost to the farmers of the United States. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if we knew anything about what we were going to get as a result of the expenditure of I know not how many millions more on this plant, I might be in favor of it. But there never was a proposition brought to this House as to which Members knew less about what the final result might be than the one that is now proposed.

There are many processes for the manufacture of nitrate from the air or of obtaining nitrate compounds. Of all the processes that have been proposed the cyanamid process is the most expensive. Of all the processes that require a great deal of power the cyanamid process requires the most power, and of all that require expensive machinery to carry it out the cyanamid process requires the most expensive machinery in the obtaining of nitrates from the air. I am speaking now of the cost of the plant, not of the ultimate product. What that would

cost I do not claim to know, and I do not think anyone can properly estimate what it would be at Muscle Shoals.

An extremely simple and comparatively inexpensive process was invented by Prof. Boscher and offered to the Government without any expense whatever as far as royalties are concerned. So far as the cyanamid process is concerned, if any gentleman has stated what the royalty will be, I do not know of it. All I know is that the royalties will have to be paid to the concern pushing this process, the concern that is back of the propaganda that has been going on.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I can say to the gentleman, if I may be allowed, that the royalties will amount to something over a million dollars. I can further state to the gentleman in this respect that the concern to which it will go is not back of the effort to bring this about, but, on the contrary, is bitterly opposed to it.

Mr. ALMON. I will state that there is a stipulated price of \$5 a ton royalty up until June, 1921, but after that it is to be a subject of arbitration and they expect it to be very much less, depending on the amount.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Here is \$5 per ton to start with. Then there will be a large amount of calcium carbide used. In the process air is compressed and cooled until it liquefies. Then the nitrogen is boiled off at 194° C. But then you only have nitrogen gas, and we can not use it in that form. The next operation in the process is to pass the gas over pulverized and heated calcium carbide in a retort. The gas is absorbed by the carbide, forming calcium cyanamid, from which the process gets its name. Calcium cyanamid can be used in making fertilizer, or ammonium sulphate, which is better, can be made from it. But calcium carbide is expensive. How expensive those who use it to make acetylene gas well know. How fertilizer can be manufactured cheaply by any process that requires its use in the way described is more than I can imagine.

As the plant is expected to turn out 110,000 tons a year of ammonium sulphate, \$5 per ton would amount to over half a million dollars a year. The claim that the owners of the patent are not working to get this measure through is incredible to me. No one else wants their patents. As I was about to remark, Prof. Boscher invented a simple process of obtaining nitrate. It was not to obtain nitrate from the air, because that would require immense power and expensive material. His process required neither great power nor expensive materials. The Government did make a small appropriation for the purpose of carrying out the experiment with reference to his process, but it never got far enough to complete any of the operations under this process, which, I think, was to be carried on at Virginia. The end of the war ended that also. So far as the cyanamid process is concerned, it is an experiment, and an experiment that has been discarded practically by those that have had the most experience. Germany tried it, and instead of using it used the Haber process, a simpler process, one which requires far less power. It is said that Germany has not the power that we have and could not obtain it as cheaply. But when you commence to talk about power, only about 3 per cent of the power is finally transmitted into nitrate under the cyanamid process.

Of course, all processes making nitrates from the air require a great amount of power. We need none to make ammonium sulphate from the by-products of coke ovens, when this style is used. We ought to encourage the building of this kind of ovens in order to save the tar and other by-products so necessary in the dye industry and also useful for making explosives. We need these ovens far more both in war and in peace than we need this plant at Muscle Shoals. But private initiative will furnish us the coke ovens, all the ammonium sulphate, the material for dyes, if we do not put the Government in competition by the expenditure of \$20,000,000.

The other processes which might be used in this country have all of the advantages that they would have in Germany, because they do not require so much power and consequently would be less expensive. Power costs money, whether in this country or in Germany, and extensive experiments with the use of coal and water have failed to show that water power after all is really so much cheaper than coal, except in some very favored localities where the water power can be very cheaply obtained. Muscle Shoals is not such a place.

What do we know about this plant? Have any definite figures been given to prove how much ammonium sulphate would cost when manufactured by this plant? None. The figures given are merely estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. All of that information is in the hearings of the Senate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have read that.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman stated with reference to the cyanamid processes not being good, and I would state that there were 14 cyanamid processes in operation before the war commenced in 1914, and now about 35 in operation in different countries, and Germany to-day is producing about 135,000 tons a year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Germany is producing several times that amount by the Bader process. It really never has been produced in Germany in a commercial way unless the factory was manufacturing more of something else than ammonium sulphate, when the cyanamid process was used. My understanding is that Germany has used waste gas from other products to obtain power for this process, and thus obtained cheap power. All figures given are merely war capacity. I repeat that no gentleman knows and no one has attempted to give the figures as to what this would cost the Government. The figures that we have are merely estimates.

No board of engineers has considered and deliberated on the various processes for making nitrates either from the air or obtaining them by some other process to determine which is the better, which is the more economic, and which is the best suited to our use. Individual engineers, it is true, have given their opinion with reference to these particular processes and as to what could be done, and it is said they could manufacture nitrates or ammonia sulphate, I suppose, the substance ordinarily used for fertilizer, for one-half the price at which it was sold when it was at the high price which it brought during the war. Suppose that to be true, still we can obtain our ammonium sulphate much cheaper than by that method, and we can obtain it in abundance from the products of the coke ovens, which we have not yet half developed, and by which we could obtain far more sulphate than we could from the air.

Mr. FESS. What is the amount that we now produce from the coke ovens?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] gave the figures. I think about 500,000 tons.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That was the figure for last year.

Mr. FESS. Is that anywhere near the maximum of our ability to produce?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not near the maximum of our ability, not one-half, if use could be found for it.

Mr. ALMON. I would state to the gentleman that heretofore the price for nitrate of sodium or Chilean nitrate has been the same as a general rule as for the ammonium sulphate, for the nitrogen contents. There has been a uniformity of price between the by-products of the coke ovens and the Chilean nitrates. There has been no competition.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There will be other competition. I received a letter from a concern this morning stating that they are manufacturing nitrates by the arc process, and have invested already three-fourths of a million dollars in their plants. The letter was addressed to me, evidently in ignorance of what is going on at this time, because what they wanted to know was whether there was likely to be tariff on the cheaper German products which have been recently dumped at New York at low price. This concern said that they would be able to manufacture all that would be demanded in this country, and yet we propose to put the Government into competition with these private concerns to manufacture this substance.

If ammonium nitrate could be in fact cheaply made, as gentlemen claim, there would be no trouble in finding a corporation that would buy the plant as its stands and pay a round sum for it. Instead it is conceded that nobody would give a copper cent for it except to junk it, nor would anyone lease it when completed, rent free, to make ammonium nitrate.

Mr. Chairman, this whole proposition is the most unbusiness-like of any I ever saw submitted to Congress; it is simply a continuation of the wasteful methods used during the war by the present administration, and I am utterly opposed to it. The plant is not needed either in war or peace.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15422, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on present business conditions. I desire to include therein the inaugural address of Gov. Miller, of New York, a very able address on financial and governmental problems, free from partisanship and political discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in every field of our social and economic life there are signs of unrest, discontent, and uncertainty. Business prospects appear unfavorable; falling prices, decreasing wages, and increasing unemployment continue; industry hesitates and enterprise falters, pending the adjustment of conditions incident to the transition period through which the Nation is passing. We are in the process of change from a period of extravagance and inflation to a period of economy and retrenchment. How long it will be before normal conditions again prevail no one can say, but it is evident that the prevalent opinion on the part of economists and experienced business men indicates that improvement will come with the passing of the winter, and that the advance once established will be continual from that time onward.

These times of stress and doubt call for steady heads and courageous hearts; for patience and steadfastness; and for an abiding faith in the perpetuity of our institutions, the stability of law, and the ability of achievement of the American Nation. This is the hour for the optimist; for the man of vision; for the man with confidence and determination; for the man who is unafraid; for the man who can read in the future the majestic sweep forward of his country. Standing on the threshold of a new year, the faith of America is undiminished and her spirit is undaunted. The Nation faces the to-morrows with supreme confidence that the period of travail will be passed in safety and that the future offers an assurance of peace, prosperity, and a return to normal conditions.

On Saturday last the Hon. Nathan L. Miller was inaugurated governor of the State of New York. His address was such an able document and so replete with sound political and economic wisdom that I feel a wide opportunity should be given for its perusal. I have therefore asked that it be inserted in the Record.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. NATHAN L. MILLER, OF NEW YORK.

In taking up the reins of the government I have a profound sense of responsibility and a genuine feeling of personal limitation. The problem of government has grown so complex, the questions presented are so varied and multitudinous, time and human capacity are so limited, that one would cease effort for despair of achievement did he not take note of the slow stages of human progress.

NECESSITY OF SAVING.

We have reached a time in the affairs of government when it is necessary to pause and take stock. We have passed through an era of spending; we are now confronted with the economic necessity of saving. The dollar has been so cheap that there has been little thought of denying any want, public or private, and our wants have grown by what they fed on until we have reached a stage of spending whose very extravagance will help to effect its cure. The State has embarked on new activities and undertaken new functions to satisfy almost every demand vociferous enough to appear popular, and to apply theoretical cures to almost every ill capable of arousing emotion or appealing to sentiment, and in my judgment the State has wandered far afield from the true function of government.

We all agree that the purpose of government is to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number. We differ only as to how that can best be done. I belong to the school which holds that human happiness depends upon human progress, which the State can best promote by affording free play and maintaining fair play of individual effort of initiative. The publicists of the day are numerous who appear to think that progress consists in changing fundamental concepts.

TRUTH DOES NOT CHANGE.

Truth does not change. Error alone is variable. A principle of government if sound to-day will remain sound until human nature changes. It is only the application of the principle that needs to be varied to fit the changing conditions of society. But too many of our political philosophers, as it seems to me, in their eagerness to keep on the crest of so-called progressive thought, confuse the principle with its application.

I was surprised recently to read from the pen of a prominent publicist that principles grounded in the very bedrock foundation of our institutions had been proven unsound and discarded everywhere else in the world but in America. The truth is that they have never been really tested anywhere else in the world but in America, and I am proud to proclaim the belief that the Constitution of the United States is still the greatest charter of human liberty ever struck off by "the brain and pen of man."

Our very humanitarianism leads us to try experiments at the expense of those whom we wish to serve, for it must be remembered that the mistakes of government and the extravagance of government bear heaviest upon the least able. Those who are now unfortunately seeking

employment must appreciate the truth that they pay for burdensome taxation which withdraws capital from industry and restricts the means of employment.

PERIOD OF FEWER LAWS.

We have passed through a period of legislative activity. I hope we are entering upon a period of fewer laws and better observance of the law.

Disorder, extravagance, and waste inevitably attend a rapid extension of government activities. The world is now facing the task of reestablishing order, and our first concern should be to establish order and to restore economy in the public administration.

To that task of State government I promise to devote myself, and I invite the cooperation of the legislature, the heads of departments, and all civil employees of the State, and the support of the public. With that cooperation and support we shall succeed. Without it little can be done.

I may have occasion to criticize methods, but they are usually a product of the times, and criticism of them does not necessarily involve personal reflection. Indeed, in demanding order and economy I am merely voicing what is already so vocal in the land that the public official is deaf indeed who does not heed it.

HEW TO THE LINE.

We have got to hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may. The business of the State has grown to such huge proportions that there is little room for sentiment and no place whatever for favoritism, personal or political, in the ordering of it.

By that I do not mean that party considerations are to be ignored. The Republican Party has been charged with undivided responsibility for the conduct of the State government, and we, who for the time being are entrusted with the duties of government, can serve our party efficiently only by efficient service to all the people of the State. We are necessarily a government of parties, and the two-party system is best suited to our institutions. It is therefore in the public interest to strengthen party organization, to make it responsive to the public needs, and to promote order in the conduct of its affairs.

RESPONSIBLE TO PUBLIC.

But when we cross the threshold of public office our responsibility is to the public, not to the party, and we have a right to demand party support in the discharge of that responsibility, while we in turn respect the true functions of party organization, through which alone that support can be made effective.

We who enter upon the discharge of official duty to-day are on trial. Our party is on trial. The task is heavy. The responsibility is great, because undivided. We shall be judged solely by results—by success or failure. On behalf of the legislature, the coordinate branch of government, as well as on behalf of my associates and myself in the administrative branch, I feel that I can promise the people that we shall at least try to serve them.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution of the Senate and message of the President of the United States, which were read, as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 3, 1921.

The President of the United States having returned to the Senate, in which it originated, the joint resolution S. J. Res. 212, "Joint resolution directing the War Finance Corporation to take certain action for the relief of the present depression in the agricultural sections of the country, and for other purposes," with his objections thereto, the Senate proceeded, in conformity with the Constitution, to reconsider the same, and has

Resolved, That the joint resolution do pass, two-thirds of the Senate agreeing to pass the same.

Attest:

GEORGE A. SANDESON,
Secretary.

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning, without my signature, Senate joint resolution 212:

Joint resolution directing the War Finance Corporation to take certain action for the relief of the present depression in the agricultural sections of the country, and for other purposes.

The joint resolution directs the revival of the activities of the War Finance Corporation. This corporation is a governmental agency. Its capital stock is owned entirely by the United States. It was created during hostilities for war purposes. The temporary powers which it is now proposed to revive were conferred in March, 1919, to assist, if necessary, in the financing of exports. The general powers of the corporation expire six months after the termination of the war, and the special powers with respect to the financing of exports expire one year after the termination of the war. While we are technically still in a state of war, it unquestionably was presumed, when this added power was granted, that peace would have been formally proclaimed before this time and that the limitation of one year would have expired.

In May, 1920, in view of the fact that export trade had not been interrupted but had greatly expanded, and that exports were being privately financed in large volumes, the War Finance Corporation, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury and with my approval, suspended the making of advances.

This resolution was passed by the Congress apparently in view of the recent sudden and considerable fall in prices, especially of agricultural commodities, with the thought that some European countries to which certain products were customarily

shipped before the war might again be enabled to resume their importation and that larger masses of domestic exports to European countries generally might be stimulated, with the resulting enhancement of domestic prices. I am in full sympathy with every sound proposal to promote foreign trade along sound business lines. I am not convinced that the method proposed is wise, that the benefits, if any, would offset the evils which would result, or that the same or larger advantages can not be secured without resort to Government intervention. On the contrary, I apprehend that the resumption of the corporation's activities at this time would exert no beneficial influence on the situation in which improvement is sought, would raise false hopes among the very people who would expect most, and would be hurtful to the natural and orderly processes of business and finance.

Large Government credits were extended during the war to certain European governments associated with us in the struggle. These ceased several months after the armistice, except for commitments already made. They should not now be resumed, either directly or indirectly. The recent Brussels conference, composed of experts from many European countries and from other nations, itself expressed the opinion that further credits should not be accorded directly by governments. I do not believe that they should be accorded indirectly.

Exports of domestic products have not declined since the armistice. On the contrary, they have greatly increased. From an aggregate value before the war of less than two and one-half billions of dollars, and of about six billions the last year of hostilities, they rose in the calendar year 1919 to more than \$7,900,000,000, and this figure will probably be exceeded for the last calendar year. For the first eleven months of the last calendar year we exported more than seven and one-half billion dollars' worth of domestic merchandise. These have been largely privately financed. The difficulty in the way of still larger exports does not seem to lie so much in the lack of financial ability here as in Europe's lack of means to make payment. Her productive energies and the services which she renders have not yet reached a point where they balance the value of commodities taken from this Nation, and her ability to furnish for additional exports securities which business men would feel justified in taking is restricted. The experts of the Brussels conference reported that "one of the chief obstacles to the granting of credits is the absence in borrowing countries of sufficient securities for ultimate repayment." Until this obstacle is removed it is difficult to see how materially larger exports to Europe are to be made even if exporters, aided or unaided by Government finance, stand ready to do their part. It is remarkable that Europe is able to make an effective demand for as large a volume of our goods as she is making. It is gratifying evidence of her recovery and progress toward full production and sounder financial conditions.

Under the law, if the activities of the corporation were resumed, no direct advances could be made to producers and, if they could be, they would not accomplish the objects in view. They would not create demand for our products. They could be made only to exporters or to banks engaged in financing exports, and if they did in some measure stimulate exports they would probably not have the effect apparently most desired of substantially increasing those of agricultural commodities. Already, with the larger volume of exports which Europe is taking from us, she is exercising her option of taking a smaller volume of some of our principal agricultural products, such as meats, presumably because she herself has become more largely self-sufficient, or is again providing herself with supplies from distant countries which, with the opening up of shipping since the armistice, have once more found their place in the markets of the world.

It is highly probable that the most immediate and conspicuous effect of the resumption of the corporation's activities would be an effort on the part of exporters to shift the financing of their operations from ordinary commercial channels to the Government. This would be unfortunate. It would continue the Government as an active factor in ordinary business operations. If activities of any considerable magnitude resulted, they would necessitate the imposition of additional taxes or further borrowing, either through the War Finance Corporation or by the Treasury. In either case new burdens would be laid upon all the people. Further borrowing would in all likelihood tap the very sources which might otherwise be available for private operations or which the Treasury is now compelled to reach to meet current obligations of the Government. There is no question that the borrowing of the Government should be limited to the minimum requirements, and that the Government should not be called upon further to finance private business at public expense. To the extent that Europe is able to furnish additional securities, private financial institutions here will doubtless find means of giving the necessary accommodation. The way has been opened for added legitimate efforts

to promote foreign trade. Financial agencies in aid of exports, privately financed, have already been planned to operate under the act approved December 24, 1919, authorizing the organization of banking corporations to do foreign banking business. One corporation has been organized in the South and a second of large scope is in course of development. These agencies may be expected to act as promptly and as liberally and helpfully as sound business conditions will permit. Through reliance on such enterprises, rather than through Government intervention, may we expect to secure a return to stable business relations. For many months there has been a demand that war agencies should be abolished and that there should be less Government interference with business. I have sympathized with this view, and believe that it is applicable to foreign trade as well as to domestic business. I am of the opinion that now, more than two years after the armistice, the Nation should resume its usual business methods and return to its reliance on the initiative, intelligence, and ability of its business leaders and financial institutions.

We shall not witness an immediate satisfactory adjustment of domestic and international trade relations. The burdens of war are not lifted when the fighting ceases. One sad thing about war is that it leaves behind it a legacy of economic ills and of suffering from which there is no escape. Conditions, however, are improving both here and abroad. The difficulties with which we are now confronted are of small consequence in comparison with those which we have met and overcome. Fuller restoration awaits the adoption of constructive measures of large consequence: the secure establishment of a just peace in the world; the cessation of fighting everywhere; the more complete resumption in Europe of the normal courses of industry, the return of her people to sounder fiscal and banking policies, and the breaking down within her borders of harmful restrictions.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

3 January, 1921.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. DREWRY, for one week, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. HICKS, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BELL, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. PARK, for Tuesday, January 4, 1921, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, and with the understanding that the President's veto message shall be the first matter considered to-morrow, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 4, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

289. A letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report of the Federal Trade Commission of an inquiry into the petroleum industry in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

290. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Chief of Engineers containing an additional report of publications prepared under his direction during the fiscal year 1920; to the Committee on Printing.

291. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, for control and prevention of spread of the Mexican bean beetle for the fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 952); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14158) granting the consent of Congress to H. H. Haynes to construct a dike across Mud Slough on Isthmus Inlet, in section 23, township 26 south, range 13 west, of Willamette meridian, in Oregon, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1158), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SELLS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 3747) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1159), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15078) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Rebhun, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 15492) to amend the national prohibition act to prevent the sale for medicinal purposes of all liquor testing at less than 90 proof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 15493) to provide for the return to the original owners of money and property seized under an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 15494) providing for the reservation of certain lands in Utah for two bands of Paiute Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15495) providing for the reservation of certain lands in New Mexico for the Indians of the Zia Pueblo; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 15496) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend and modify the war-risk insurance act," approved December 24, 1919; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 15497) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, and to amend section 5236 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 433) requesting the President of the United States to transmit protest against the retention of the French colored troops in the occupied area of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 434) directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States until the number of enlisted men shall not exceed 175,000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 15498) granting a pension to Mary Costin Kinnevan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15499) granting a pension to Nannie B. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 15500) granting a pension to Mary Florence Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 15501) granting a pension to Mahala Winn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15502) granting a pension to Henrietta Sheumacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15503) granting a pension to Elizabeth Pfeifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 15504) granting an increase of pension to William J. Givens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 15505) granting a pension to Lewis Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15506) granting a pension to Ruth B. Adamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 15507) granting an increase of pension to John H. Doremus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 15508) granting an increase of pension to Hannah E. Brainard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 15509) granting an increase of pension to Anis Apple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4784. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, regarding barge-line facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4785. Also, petition of St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, favoring the budget system for the National Government; to the Committee on Budget.

4786. Also, petition of Railway Mail Association, Kansas City, Mo., favoring an increase in the salaries of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4787. Also, petition of Lund-Mauldin Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4788. Also, petition of the Council of Jewish Women, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4789. Also, petition of Robert C. Brinkman, R. J. Ludwig, H. A. Dodson, Harry Schuessler, H. C. Henger, F. A. Cammann, Western Construction Co., National Enameling & Stamping Co., R. W. Van Pelt, E. R. Henckler, Emma Tabb, L. McMaster, James B. Hill, Charles Kell, A. J. Cammann, E. H. Rosemlit, and A. C. Schuchardt, all of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

4790. Also, petition of Mr. C. S. Longacre, editor of the Liberty Magazine, Washington, D. C., opposing the passage of Senate bill 635 and House bill 12504, regarding the Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4791. Also, petition of National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch 343, St. Louis, Mo., regarding increase in salaries, a court of appeals for civil-service employees, and sick and annual leave; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4792. Also, petition of G. C. Taussig, St. Louis Smelting & Refining Works, St. Louis, Mo., urging passage of House bill 11716; to the Committee on War Claims.

4793. Also, petition of St. Louis Refrigerating & Cold Storage Co., St. Louis, Mo., urging passage of House bill 12886, providing for an extension of the mineral trust period of the Osage Nation from 1931 to the year 1956; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

4794. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of South St. Paul Live Stock Exchange, South St. Paul, Minn., opposing the live-stock commission act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4795. Also, petition of South St. Paul Live Stock Exchange, South St. Paul, Minn., declaring a temporary embargo on live stock and live-stock products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4796. By Mr. KING: Petition of Post A, Travelers' Protective Association of Quincy, Ill., concerning recognition of the de facto Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4797. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Akron Council, No. 87, United Commercial Travelers of America, Akron, Ohio, favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4798. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Major McKinley Council, No. 90, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the restriction of all immigration for a period of two years; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4799. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, New York, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 161 to end Federal operation of canals in New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4800. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Utica Candy Co., Utica, N. Y., protesting against the excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4801. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of W. N. Weston Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the excess-profit regulations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4802. Also, petition of Bernard J. Rothwell, Boston, Mass., regarding emergency agricultural tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4803. Also, petition of Frank N. Nathan and Frederick T. Widmer, of Boston, Mass., protesting against an increased tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4804. Also, petition of the Holtzer Cabot Electric Co., Roxbury, Boston, Mass., favoring passage of Nolan Patent Office and salaries bill (H. R. 11984); to the Committee on Patents.

4805. Also, petition of Cadillac Automobile Co. of Boston, Boston, Mass., favoring an appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4806. Also, petition of American Board of Commissions for Foreign Missions, Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of the Jones-Miller bill (H. R. 14500) prohibiting traffic in morphia, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4807. Also, petition of David Barry, Boston, Mass., favoring an appropriation for carrying on the work of steam gauging; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4808. Also, petition of William A. L. Bazeley, State forester, Statehouse, Boston 9, Boston, Mass., urging appropriation of \$1,000,000 for cooperation with the States in fire protection; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4809. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Local Union No. 180, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers, Worcester, Mass., favoring a repeal of the wartime sedition laws and favoring amnesty for all political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4810. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Home Interest Club, of Takoma Park, Md., and the Women's Club, of Friendship Heights, Md., favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 4, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for another day and its privileges and opportunities. Enable us to realize how better we can understand the obligations of the hour and so serve Thee acceptably that Thy well done shall be received. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

REPORT ON PETROLEUM INDUSTRY IN WYOMING.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission of an inquiry into the petroleum industry in Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of the Abraham Lincoln Branch of Friends of Irish Freedom, of Topeka, Kans., favoring the recognition of the republic of Ireland as a de facto government, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Concordia, Kans., favoring an amendment to the bill to provide for the promotion of physical training in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Newkirk, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation appropriating sufficient funds to furnish necessary buildings to accommodate 300 more children in the Indian school on the Chilocco Reservation, Okla., which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Ottawa, Kans., and a petition of the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for an increased appropriation for the Weather Bureau station at Topeka, Kans., which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial signed by sundry citizens of Otis, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of District No. 24 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Saginaw, Mich., and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 352, of Lansing, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting amnesty to all political prisoners, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Washington Grange, No. 1655, of Washington, Mich., favoring the so-called French-Capper truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Washington Pomona Grange, No. 7, of Ypsilanti, Mich., favoring the so-called French-Capper truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a memorial of the Catholic Study Club, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Borah	Heflin	New	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Henderson	Norris	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Nugent	Spencer
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Stanley
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Penrose	Sutherland
Dial	Kendrick	Phipps	Thomas
Dillingham	Kenyon	Pomerene	Underwood
Edge	Knox	Reed	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott
Glass	McKellar	Simmons	

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are engaged in a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FLETCHER. I announce that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. HARRISON. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] on account of illness, and the necessary absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4762) to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4763) granting a pension to Lucy A. Richards;
A bill (S. 4764) granting a pension to Alvin E. Owens;
A bill (S. 4765) granting an increase of pension to George M. Younger;

A bill (S. 4766) granting an increase of pension to Julia S. Webb;

A bill (S. 4767) granting a pension to John H. Riley;
A bill (S. 4768) granting a pension to Melissa S. Lemon;
A bill (S. 4769) granting an increase of pension to Eveline Washington;

A bill (S. 4770) granting a pension to Mary E. Martin;
A bill (S. 4771) granting a pension to Harry Hawkes;
A bill (S. 4772) granting a pension to Caldonia Doan; and
A bill (S. 4773) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Moss (each with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4774) granting an increase of pension to Sarah V. Cribb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 4775) to authorize Louis M. Tisdale to construct and operate a ship canal or channel from Mon Louis Island, Mobile County, State of Alabama, to the deep-water basin in Mobile Bay, between Fort Morgan and Fort Gaines, Ala., through the lands and waters of the United States, and to grant to said Louis M. Tisdale the right of way for that purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4776) for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 4777) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Reynolds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.